

ROYAL ENDOWMENT OF PEERAGE CREATIONS IN THE REIGN OF EDWARD III

James S. Bothwell Botton

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD
at the
University of St Andrews



1996

Full metadata for this item is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/14570>

This item is protected by original copyright

ROYAL ENDOWMENT OF PEERAGE CREATIONS
IN THE REIGN OF EDWARD III

James S. Bothwell Botton

A thesis submitted in fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of Ph.D.
at the University of St. Andrews

27 September 1995



ProQuest Number: 10166568

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10166568

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

.Th B920

DECLARATION

I, James Bothwell Botton, hereby certify that this thesis, which is approximately 93,000 words in length, has been written by me, that it is the record of work carried out by me, and that it has not been submitted in any previous application for a higher degree.

September 27, 1995 _____

I was admitted as a research student in October of 1991 and as a candidate for the degree of doctor of philosophy at the same time; the higher study for which this is a record was carried out in the University of St. Andrews between 1991 and 1995.

September 27, 1995 _____

I hereby certify that the candidate has fulfilled the conditions of the Resolution and Regulations appropriate for the degree of doctor of philosophy in the University of St. Andrews and that the candidate is qualified to submit this thesis in application for that degree.

September 27, 1995 _____

In submitting this thesis to the University of St. Andrews I understand that I am giving permission for it to be made available for use in accordance with the regulations of the University Library for the time being in force, subject to any copyright vested in the work not being affected thereby. I also understand that the title and abstract will be published, and that a copy of the work may be made and supplied to any bona fide library or research worker.

September 27, 1995 _____

ABSTRACT

This thesis is an examination of the use Edward III made of various resources at his disposal in order to patronize a number of individuals destined for the parliamentary peerage or beyond. Primarily through a judicious use of escheats, forfeitures and expectancies, though also through his control over the marriages of his tenants-in-chief, Edward managed to endow a considerable number of new men with properties both suitable to their existing estates and commensurate with their new ranks.

Edward's use of these sources, along with temporary forms of patronage such as wardships, annuities, offices and smaller token forms of favour, unsurprisingly sparked a considerable amount of contemporary reaction. However, unlike previous favourites, though Edward's new men did have to contend with a substantial amount of opposition at an individual level - especially in the law courts - popular reaction in general was surprisingly mute. Though there were instances when these men were singled out for criticism, for the most part landed society as a whole, and the established nobility in particular, received them with a degree of toleration rarely exhibited to parvenus. In part due to Edward's use of propaganda, but also to the terms on which he granted out a large portion of the patronage, Edward's new creations were seen as complementing rather than threatening the existing order. Indeed, it was Edward himself who may be said to have limited the powers of his 'new nobility' not only by making them dependent on his goodwill, but also by not allowing for much of the patronage

granted out to remain out indefinitely. In the end, then, this thesis is about the first coherent realization by an English monarch of the importance of controlling the composition of the parliamentary peerage at a time when its membership was becoming increasingly predetermined.

PREFACE

In pursuing their Enquiries, the First Committee proposed to seek for Evidence, throughout the whole Period from the Norman Conquest, of the Nature of the Dignity of Peer of the Realm, (including the Powers and Privileges of a Lord of Parliament,) as considered at different Periods from the Norman Conquest to the present Time; of the Origin of the different Degrees of Dignity of which the Peerage is composed; of the Means by which the Right to the Dignity, and to an Inheritance therein, have at different Times been acquired; in what Manner and under what Circumstances such Rights have been deemed to have been forfeited, lost, extinguished or suspended, and in what Manner Rights so forfeited, lost extinguished or suspended, have been restored or revived.¹

And, over the course of fourteen years and five parliamentary reports, a series of committees did just that.² Indeed, the question of who has the right to be called to the highest order in the land has always been an issue, as much today as it was two centuries ago - as witness the perennial debate over admittance to, and the retention of, hereditary peerages.³ Yet much of what came to be seen as the monarch's role in elevations had been delineated early on in

¹ Reports from the Lords' Committees Appointed to Search the Journals of the House, Rolls of Parliament, and Other Records for All Matters Touching the Dignity of a Peer, in Journal of the House of Lords vol. lvi (1824), 471. All future references to RDP will be of the volume and page numbers of the Journal.

² For a useful guide to the location of each of the reports of this Committee in the Journal of the House of Lords, see E.B. Graves, ed., A Bibliography of English History to 1485 (1975), 515-16.

³ One of the latest incarnations of this debate was the introduction of a bill to abolish the right of hereditary peers to sit in the House of Lords. According to Bruce Grocott, Labour MP, hereditary peers are "the most bizarre and indefensible composition [sic] of any parliamentary chamber". The bill, which obtained an unopposed first reading, was, however, considered to have "little chance of becoming law". "Hereditary Peers under Attack", The Times (16 June 1994), 8.

the institution's history, before precedent had been permanently set. Indeed, as much as anything else, then, this dissertation is the story of the first coherent realization by a ruling monarch of the growing importance of the parliamentary peerage and the necessity of influencing its composition.

CONTENTS

TEXT

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Escheats, Forfeitures, and Expectancies	28
Chapter 3: Marriage Rights and Arrangements	68
Chapter 4: Wardships	92
Chapter 5: Annuities	112
Chapter 6: Miscellaneous Patronage	141
Chapter 7: Contemporary Reaction	165
Chapter 8: Conclusion	203

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: New Creations (1330-1377)	217
Appendix 2: Escheats, Forfeitures, and Expectancies	220
Appendix 3: Marriage Rights and Arrangements	228
Appendix 4: Wardships	231
Appendix 5a: Annuities Granted	234
5b: Examples of Assignments	237
5c: Annuity Payment Rates	248
Appendix 6: Major Offices Held	250
Appendix 7: Court Cases	253
Appendix 8: Principal Geographical Interests	257

<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	260
---------------------	-----

ABBREVIATIONS

Complete citations are given in the Bibliography

<u>AD</u>	<u>A Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient Deeds in the Public Record Office</u>
<u>BIHR</u>	<u>Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research</u>
BL	British Library
BRS	British Record Society
<u>CChanR</u>	<u>Calendar of Chancery Rolls</u>
<u>CCharR</u>	<u>Calendar of Charter Rolls</u>
<u>CCR</u>	<u>Calendar of Close Rolls</u>
<u>CCW</u>	<u>Calendar of Chancery Warrants</u>
<u>CDRS</u>	<u>Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland</u>
<u>CFR</u>	<u>Calendar of Fine Rolls</u>
<u>CIM</u>	<u>Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous</u>
<u>CIPM</u>	<u>Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem</u>
<u>CMemR</u>	<u>Calendar of Memoranda Rolls: Exchequer</u>
<u>CPR</u>	<u>Calendar of Patent Rolls</u>
CS	Camden Society
<u>DNB</u>	<u>Dictionary of National Biography</u>
<u>EGW</u>	<u>English Government at Work</u>
<u>EHR</u>	<u>English Historical Review</u>
GEC	<u>The Complete Peerage</u>
<u>HMC</u>	<u>Historical Manuscripts Commission</u>
<u>HMSO</u>	<u>Her Majesty's Stationary Office</u>
<u>JMH</u>	<u>Journal of Medieval History</u>
PRO	Public Record Office

<u>RDP</u>	<u>Reports . . . Touching the</u> <u>Dignity of a Peer</u>
RS	Rolls Series
<u>SR</u>	<u>Statutes of the Realm</u>
<u>TRHS</u>	<u>Transactions of the Royal</u> <u>Historical Society</u>
<u>VCH</u>	<u>Victoria County History</u>

CHAPTER ONE Introduction

Among the signs of royalty we considered it to be the most important that, through a suitable distribution of ranks, dignities and offices, the position (vallatum) is sustained by the wise counsels and protected by the many powers of formidable men. Yet, the hereditary ranks in our kingdom, both through hereditary descent to coheirs and coparceners according to the law of the kingdom and through a failure of issue and various other events, having returned into the hand of the king, this realm has experienced for a long time a substantial loss in the names, honours and ranks of dignity.¹

Repeated in three of the charters creating new earls in 1337,² this is perhaps the most cited passage concerning Edward III's peerage creations.³ After all, in reaction to this situation, Edward effectively created a new elite of the highest order with which to govern the kingdom - sometimes referred to as a "new English higher nobility".⁴ Yet, this was only part, though important, of a larger programme of elevation and patronage, a programme inextricably linked with both the general developments taking place in the nobility in the later Middle Ages and with the more specific circumstances surrounding Edward's

¹ From the charter raising Robert Ufford to the earldom of Suffolk on 16 March 1337. As translated from RDP lxi (1829), 741.

² See RDP lxi (1829), 740-45.

³ See also J.E. Powell and K. Wallis, The House of Lords in the Middle Ages: A History of the English House of Lords to 1540 (1968), 326; B.P. Wolffe, The Royal Demesne in English History: The Crown Estate in the Governance of the Realm from the Conquest to 1509 (1971), 59; C. Given-Wilson, The English Nobility in the Late Middle Ages: The Fourteenth-Century Political Community (1987), 35. Moreover, this is usually the aspect of Edward's patronage referred to by contemporary chroniclers. See pp. 195-96.

⁴ For example, see Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 36.

accession to the throne. It is with the former that we shall begin this discussion of Edward III's 'new men'.

One of the valuable aspects of looking at the nobility in the fourteenth century is that it was only in this period that it began to know any firm definition. Before this, while the landowning classes could not have been said to be simply an "undifferentiated mass",⁵ since certain individuals did take precedence because of previous history and/or size of land holdings,⁶ nonetheless there was no formal distinction between the different members of this group whether in society as a whole or in parliament in particular. Rather, it was only in 1316 that the phrases 'peers of the land' or 'peers of the realm' first surfaced in an address by Thomas, earl of Lancaster to the parliament at Lincoln.⁷ The use of the term at this time had its basis mainly in previous feudal usage,⁸ and can be dated back at least as far as Magna Carta, clause 39 - namely, that "no free man shall be taken or imprisoned or disseised or outlawed or exiled or in any other way ruined, nor will we go, or send against him, except by the lawful judgement of his peers or by the law of the land".⁹ Lancaster's use of the term, then, foreshadowed the recognition of the peerage as a

⁵ K.B. McFarlane, The Nobility of Later Medieval England (1973; reprint 1980), 268.

⁶ See Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 56-58.

⁷ Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 284.

⁸ Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 284-85.

⁹ J.C. Holt, Magna Carta (1965), 327.

new order with specific rights and privileges. By Edward III's reign, according to Waugh, the designation "peer" had become commonplace.¹⁰

On a more concrete level, the list of individual parliamentary summons (ie. that which was said to designate a peer of the realm) was becoming increasingly predetermined. Until the beginning of the fourteenth century summons to parliament had in no way been a set or hereditary right for individuals, let alone families, but rather "depended on the king's will, the caprice of chancery, the kind of business to be transacted, [and] the length of time at the government's disposal".¹¹ However, the period between the accession of Edward II in 1307 and the Nottingham coup of 1330 witnessed, according to Powell and Wallis, the rise of a standardized summons list for parliament, one based on a mixture of 'precedent, the record and the shadowy notion of barony',¹² and one on which the names of individuals, and thence their families, began to reappear with increasing regularity.¹³ There were times when the list was virtually copied from one year to the next and, though there were major changes therein, usually due to political upheavals, nonetheless the idea that certain of the king's subjects, and consequently their descendants, had a right to be summoned to parliament had taken root.¹⁴

¹⁰ S.L. Waugh, England in the Reign of Edward III (1991), 119.

¹¹ G.O. Sayles, The King's Parliament of England (1975), 72.

¹² Paraphrased from Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 315.

¹³ See Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 303-15.

¹⁴ For a summary of Powell and Wallis's findings, see Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 58. McFarlane and Brown also make similar points, though the latter does note three late cases of individuals being summoned only once in the 1370's.

This development, probably in part due to the unstable situation existing in the kingdom during Edward II's reign and the Minority,¹⁵ helped to cause a subtle yet important change in the position of the nobility with respect to the king. For, just as in the twelfth century, the gradual growth of the concept of inheritance had come to ease the king's control over his subjects,¹⁶ so, in practice, had the later development of the idea that certain individuals had a right to be called to parliament. Though the king still had the final word over who was individually summoned in the fourteenth century, as he had had before, the growing tradition surrounding the summons list meant that any major changes therein, at least in terms of deletions, were not commonplace. It was surprising, then, as time wore on, if families traditionally connected with parliamentary summons were permanently omitted from the list once they had been called.¹⁷ In other words, the strength of custom had helped delineate, and therefore limit - to a certain degree at least - the king's powers in this respect.¹⁸

McFarlane, Nobility, 274; A.L. Brown, The Governance of Late Mediaeval England: 1272-1461 (1989), 180.

¹⁵ According to Powell and Wallis, "... the fact that for much of the period 1307-30 the Crown was under tutelage of some sort or other facilitated such a development [ie. the stabilization of the summons list]". In another, though similar, vein, A.L. Brown states "Repeated summons is likely to lead to greater regularity of summons and the disputes between Edward II and his magnates must also have encouraged it". Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 315; Brown, Governance of Late Medieval England, 180.

¹⁶ For the latest major treatment of the development of inheritance, see J. Hudson, Land, Law, and Lordship in Anglo-Norman England (1994), esp. 65-156.

¹⁷ Even John Maltravers, intimately connected with the deaths of Edward II and the earl of Kent, was again summoned in 1351. See G.E.C. viii, 581-83; and below, p. 7.

¹⁸ Moreover, the fact that the peers, acting as an increasingly distinct social group, played an important part

But this was not the only potentially negative development which faced Edward III on his assumption of independent rule in 1330. His position was further, and probably more visibly - at least to contemporaries - compromised by the political history of the last two decades. A litany of misgovernment and failure haunted early fourteenth century kingship, most notably in the form of the rise of Piers de Gaveston, the Ordinances of 1311, the Battle of Bannockburn, the Treaty of Leake, the Contrariants and the tyranny of the Despensers. And, of course, at the end of all this lay the premature demise of a king. For, for the first time in recorded history, a sitting English monarch was deposed - a deposition, moreover, which had the approval of parliament.¹⁹ For the next three years, the status of the monarchy remained in political limbo, of use only to rubber-stamp the actions of Edward II's queen, Isabella, and her lover, Roger Mortimer.²⁰ It was only when, on 19 October 1330, Edward III and a small band of co-conspirators led by William Montagu burst into the Queen's chamber at Nottingham castle, arrested Mortimer, and placed him in transit for the execution block, that this downward spiral in the status of the monarchy was halted.

in both the deposition of Edward II and the termination of the minority government, further reflects the changing nature of relations between the king and his nobles. See Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 297-302.

¹⁹ For a discussion of the deposition, see M.V. Clarke, 'Committees of Estates and the Deposition of Edward II', in J.G. Edwards, V.H. Galbraith and E.F. Jacobs, eds., Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait (1933), 27-45.

²⁰ For a good general overview of the events of this period, especially with respect to royal relations with the nobility, see A. Tuck, Crown and Nobility 1272-1461: Political Conflict in Late Medieval England (1985), 50-102.

But obviously, though Edward III had arrested this descent for the time being, his future was far from certain. With a parliamentary peerage growing in power which was, moreover, packed with men whose presence had been decided either by Isabella's minority government or by Edward II, and a titled nobility weakened by political misadventure, not to mention line failure,²¹ Edward III faced a situation which would have been daunting to the most experienced of leaders, let alone the eighteen year son of a deposed king.²² And yet, within three decades, Edward III had established a rapport with his nobility which was to become a byword for good royal/noble relations -²³ a relationship, moreover, which can be seen as the direct result of a conscious effort on the king's part to re-establish supremacy over the

²¹ According to Given-Wilson, as a result of such circumstances, the number of the titled nobility had declined to eight and

What is more, few of them were men after the young Edward's own heart. Oxford was seventy-two and had been retired from public life for many years. Henry of Lancaster, although only restored to his inheritance in 1327, was already forty-nine and going blind. John de Warrene, earl of Surrey, was forty-four and not much of a force to be reckoned with in the new reign, while Thomas of Brotherton, earl of Norfolk, although active militarily during the early years of the reign, was apparently an unpopular figure and there is nothing to suggest that Edward greatly lamented his death in 1338.

Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 34; see also W.M. Ormrod, The Reign of Edward III: Crown and Political Society in England 1327-1377 (1990), 97.

²² Indeed, it was little surprise that at least one contemporary felt it necessary to give the young king some tips on how to run the country. See De Speculo Regis Edwardi Terti ed. J. Moisant (1891).

²³ As has been noted by Vale. J. Vale, Edward III and Chivalry: Chivalric Society and its Context 1270-1350 (1982), 3.

nobility of the realm. This effort, which appears to have had enough unity both in theory and in execution to be called a 'programme', may be seen to be made up of two separate though interconnected components. Firstly, through a show of clemency to the trouble-makers of the previous decade, Edward III gradually brought the majority of the existing nobility back into the fold of loyal service to the king. Though this was difficult, if not impossible, with a dangerous figure like Roger Mortimer, or with men intimately connected with the political murders of the previous regime such as John Maltravers,²⁴ Edward nonetheless managed to come to an accommodation with most of those, or at least their families, who had caused problems during the 1320's. The earl of Arundel's heir was restored to his inheritance and granted an important part of the Mortimer estate.²⁵ The earl of Lancaster, along with the earl of Norfolk and Hugh de Audley, who had taken part in the 1328-29 'rebellion', were forgiven their misdeeds as well as rather substantial bonds to which they had been forced to acquiesce.²⁶ Even Queen Isabella, though made to disgorge most of the lands which she had accumulated during her son's minority, was nonetheless given a healthy income of £3000 a year - though this may have been more a result of filial duty than any feeling that his mother warranted forgiveness.²⁷ More surprisingly, during the course of the 1330's, Hugh

²⁴ Though in 1351 the latter was pardoned for his part in the events of the Minority and granted back all his lands. CPR 1350-54, 224.

²⁵ Namely, the lordship of Chirk in South Wales. Tuck, Crown and Nobility, 103-04.

²⁶ For example of a pardon concerning Audley, see p. 150.

²⁷ See Tuck, Crown and Nobility, 103.

Despenser the Younger's heir was gradually brought back into the king's good graces,²⁸ as was Edmund Mortimer - the latter being granted back a substantial part of his father's estate, notably at the instigation of the lords.²⁹

Nonetheless, to allow the nobility left over from his father's regime or from the Minority to monopolize the patronage at the king's disposal - as well as the government of the kingdom - was to risk, if not repeating mistakes, then at least a return to old power struggles.³⁰ Indeed, while Edward did gradually come to an accommodation with the established nobility, a final settlement seems to have eluded him into the 1340's.³¹ As the reign progressed, moreover, Edward was to find that domestic responsibilities were not the only matters which made a more dependable nobility desirable. First with the campaigns in Scotland, then with the outbreak of the Hundred Years War in France, Edward III was to be in desperate need of men not only able to govern the realm after his fashion, but also willing to

²⁸ See p. 38, footnote 44.

²⁹ For a discussion of the history of Mortimer lands in this period, see G.A. Holmes, The Estates of the Higher Nobility in Fourteenth Century England (1957), 10-19.

³⁰ A similar point has also been made by Anthony Tuck. Tuck, Crown and Nobility, 105.

³¹ Up until quite recently, Edward's relationship with his nobility, outside of the crisis of 1340-41, had been seen to be one of harmony. Put down mainly to Edward's level-headedness in dealing out justice after the 1330 coup, the king and the mighty of the realm have been painted as being of one mind, mainly in pursuit of either a Scottish or a French enemy. However, more recently, Ormrod has convincingly challenged this view, seeing the 1330's as a period when animosities festered under the surface, which only came to an end after the cathartic crisis of 1340-41, when the war in France had begun to go well. For an example of the former view, see Tuck, Crown and Nobility, 102-111; for the latter, see Ormrod, Edward III, 11, 12, 16-17; W.M. Ormrod, 'Edward III and the Recovery of Royal Authority in England', History 72 (1987), 4-19.

fight abroad on his command.³² This, then, along with the fact that the growing importance of contract armies often left the king a debtor to the same nobles,³³ made a supportive and loyal nobility crucial.

Finally, a more general demographic crisis within the nobility during this period also heralded problems for the king. For, while an unsupportive nobility was definitely a problem for the monarchy, neither could a king expect to govern competently without one sufficiently large. Indeed, line failure or the descent to coheirs, usually women, was one of the banes of the late medieval English aristocracy.³⁴ McFarlane especially emphasized the tendency for families of the higher nobility to die out in the male line during the later Middle Ages.³⁵ This, considering that the right to summons was not regularly transmitted through the female line,³⁶ understandably caused a decline in the number of men being summoned to parliament. Indeed, simply looking at those sixty families newly summoned between the years 1300 and 1324, fifteen were extinct in the male line by 1325, eleven more by 1350, and all but fourteen by the end of the century.³⁷ Furthermore, in terms of titled nobility, though

³² After all, it was not so long since Edward I's nobles had refused their king this service, and, as Tuck has noted, though Edward III's "nobility were seeking to maintain his [ie. the king's] honour and his inheritance, . . . they had no personal interests there [ie. in France] to safeguard". Tuck, Crown and Nobility, 117.

³³ Tuck, Crown and Nobility, 145-46.

³⁴ See the quotation on p. 1.

³⁵ Indeed, McFarlane devoted considerable time to this problem, the results of which are summarized in Nobility, 142-76.

³⁶ Though it did not necessarily have to go through the direct male line either. See Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 58-60.

³⁷ McFarlane, Nobility, 174.

the numbers had never been high,³⁸ the fact that many of these men were of a considerably older generation, or otherwise inactive, had left the king with few with which to govern his realm.³⁹

More striking, then, than his treatment of the existing nobility, was Edward III's elevation in rank of a number of individuals to the peerage and beyond in order to help him govern the kingdom.⁴⁰ Out of two hundred and twenty-seven people receiving individual summons to parliament between the years 1330 and 1377,⁴¹ Edward III called sixty who had had no previous writ, nor had their fathers or grandfathers before them, and raised eight further to the rank of earl and one further to the rank of duke.⁴² Of these sixty nine

³⁸ Except during the Anarchy. Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 29.

³⁹ See p. 6 footnote 21.

⁴⁰ I have avoided discussing Edward's elevation of his sons to the titled nobility, which, while not entirely a matter of course and certainly an issue with respect to his relations with the nobility, nonetheless cannot be considered elevations in the same sense as those raising Edward's new men. Similarly, William of Juliers, made earl of Cambridge in 1340, and Ingelram de Coucy, raised to the earldom of Bedford in 1366; as son-in-laws to the king, have been excluded from this treatment for similar reasons, and also because, as foreigners, they assumed only a limited role in English affairs. For a discussion of Edward's arrangements for his family, see W.M. Ormrod, 'Edward III and his Family', Journal of British Studies, xxvi (1987), 398-422; Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 42-47. For a more general discussion of patronage to members of the royal family, see Wolffe, Royal Demesne, 52-58. Reasons similar to the omissions of Cambridge and Bedford may be put forward for the Scottish 'disinherited' earl, Henry Beaumont, created earl of Buchan and summoned for the first time in 1334.

⁴¹ That is, from Edward's assumption of personal rule after the Nottingham Coup until his death on 21 June 1377. Representing, as it does, the period of Edward's independent rule, this will remain the time frame throughout the following discussion.

⁴² Only if a man had no previous right to a summons - either because his family had never had a summons previously or because he was of a cadet line - is he included in this

elevations,⁴³ roughly half were men who already had the wealth to sustain their new ranks, either through the generosity of Edward II or Mortimer and Isabella - or through inheritance or marriage - but had yet to receive titles commensurate with their positions.⁴⁴ This group can

list. As a result, it is somewhat different than that given by Powell and Wallis for two main reasons. Firstly, certain names are missing in comparison to Powell and Wallis's list due to the fact that they sometimes referred to eldest sons as being "new" either 1) whose fathers or grandfathers had only occasionally been summoned to parliament; or 2) whose fathers and grandfathers had been summoned frequently, but who themselves had not had been summoned since the death of their fathers (or grandfathers). For my selection of individuals, the fact that these men, or their families, were nonetheless considered of enough previous importance to be summoned in the first place excludes their sons and grandsons from the adjective 'new'. (Similar reasons have also caused me to omit the 'revived' earldoms of Devon and March from this list)

Conversely, Powell and Wallis do not tend to consider men 'new' who happen to either marry into, or gain by collateral inheritance, lands held in barony. However, it has been noted that this is going to extremes as "it is not always clear whether the crucial point was that the man in question was now a 'tenurial baron', or simply that he was now a major land holder". (Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 60). Moreover, the fact that many of these men had had their marriages arranged as a result of Edward's endowment programme, and therefore may be seen as part of their elevation, allows most of those raised during the reign to be rightly called "new". In other words, there is rarely a clear enough case of a man being summoned simply because of the identity of a recently acquired estate - rather than for other causes such as estate size or the favour of the king - that one can confidently start omitting names from the list of those 'newly' summoned as a matter of royal will. See McFarlane, Nobility, 172; Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 312-79; Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 55-61. For the list of new creations, see Appendix 1. This list also includes younger sons or cadet lines of nobles houses, as they can still mainly be said to be outwith both noble inheritances and parliamentary summons.

⁴³ Of sixty-seven men - Grosmont was newly made earl of Derby (1337) and then Duke of Lancaster (1351) while Thomas Holand was first raised to the peerage in 1354 and then called to parliament as the earl of Kent in 1360. See Appendix 1.

⁴⁴ Though outside the ambit of this thesis, a similar reasoning could be put forth for the 'restorations' of Hugh de Courtenay to the earldom of Devon in 1335 and the grandson of Roger Mortimer to the earldom of March in 1354 - though the latter also had much to do with the royal favour.

further be divided into two categories. For some, such as John Hausted, their new ranks were as much to do with their previous experience as the size of their estates. Hausted, of a Midlands gentry family, was a loyal servant of the government, no matter who was in charge, and appears to have picked up a great deal of experience in the process.⁴⁵ Of age as early as 1302,⁴⁶ though apparently taking little part in the troubles early in the next decade, Hausted was continuously of service to the government, first on the northern border,⁴⁷ then in the royalist army at Boroughbridge in 1322.⁴⁸ Later in the same year he was also made acting Marshal of the Royal Household, as well as being summoned to the Great Council in 1324. Indeed, even when there came a change of regime with the Minority, Hausted was considered of enough importance to be made steward of Gascony in 1328.⁴⁹ After the coup, aside from being summoned to parliament from 1332 until his death in 1335 or 1336, as well as being on military service in Scotland, he was made seneschal of Gascony. For Edward III, then, though by no means a favourite, Hausted was still a necessary part of a competent royalist faction within the nobility.

On the other hand, there were also men whom the king summoned not only because of their land holdings, but also

For the former, see Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 324-25; for the latter, see Holmes, Estates, 14-17.

⁴⁵ For most of what follows concerning Hausted's career, see G.E.C. vi, 402.

⁴⁶ On 18 February 1302, Hausted was noted as being pardoned for rents in arrears. CPR 1301-07, 26.

⁴⁷ CPR 1317-21, 140, 201, 301

⁴⁸ G.E.C. ii, 600.

⁴⁹ Dugdale notes Hausted being granted 200 mark annuity out of the customs of Bordeaux about this time. W. Dugdale, The Baronage of England (1676), ii, 126.

as a way to encourage faithful service to the crown where it had previously been lacking. Also called to parliament for the first time in 1332, Gilbert Talbot, son of Richard Talbot (d. 1306), was a prime candidate for such a policy.⁵⁰ Constantly anti-royalist during Edward II's reign and a "strong partisan" of the Mortimer regime,⁵¹ Talbot had amassed considerable power, especially in Wales and the southwest,⁵² and thus was something of a worry to the king as a potential "loose cannon". Such a man was obviously, at least in the king's eyes, better off in a peerage created by royal will than in a less defined, and therefore more unstable, position. But these infidelities paled in comparison with those of one such as Hugh de Audley. Audley, controlling a considerable amount of land through his wife, one of the Clare coheiresses,⁵³ was nonetheless considerably tainted with the politics of the 1320's, being at first a favourite, and then a foe,⁵⁴ of Edward II - as well as taking

⁵⁰ For an overview of Talbot's career, see G.E.C. xii:1, 610-12. One gets the impression from Powell and Wallis that Talbot had been summoned previous to the 1330 coup, but this was only to a great council. See Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 314; Appendix 1.

⁵¹ Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 314. Talbot supposedly had a hand in securing London for Queen Isabella in 1326. See N. Fryde, The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II 1321-1326 (1979), 187.

⁵² That the sum of "£2000 and a tun of wine or 40s" had been set as a fine by Edward II to get his lands back again after Boroughbridge gives some idea as to the extent of Talbot's wealth. CCR 1323-27, 220; CCR 1327-30, 35. For Talbot's estate in the area at the time of his death, much of which was acquired prior to 1330, see CIPM viii, 519-24; for the Talbot family's history in the area, see G.E.C. xii:1, 606-10. Probably in recognition of this, he was made Justice of South Wales immediately after the coup. CPR 1330-34, 10.

⁵³ For the couple's share in the estate, see M. Altschul, A Baronial Family in Medieval England: The Clares 1217-1314 (1965), 170-71.

⁵⁴ Audley was a 'Contrariant'. CFR 1319-27, 84; G.E.C. ii, 598. See also Fryde, Tyranny and Fall, 26, 34, 44, 55.

a part in the rebellion of 1328.⁵⁵ But, though Audley was never to be a close companion of Edward III,⁵⁶ nonetheless, in the batch of new creations made in March of 1337, he was made the earl of Gloucester - in part, no doubt, as a reflection of the estate he held through his wife, but also as a way to keep him contented.⁵⁷ Indeed, even Henry of Grosmont, though apparently not himself a party to the events of the previous decade,⁵⁸ came from a tradition of opposition, or at the very least lack of adherence to the royal will. Thus, his elevation and patronage might, in part at least, be seen as a recognition by the king of his membership in this second group.⁵⁹

These men, then, for better or worse, were a necessary part of the official echelons of society. More radically, Edward raised roughly thirty men to the peerage and beyond who had clearly no previous claim to their elevations in terms of their estates.⁶⁰ These men were mainly of three types. The first were the middling to upper gentry, such as Reginald de Cobham of Sterborough, a man of some prominence

⁵⁵ A rebellion, it should be noted, in which Edward III would not participate. See Tuck, Crown and Nobility, 99-102.

⁵⁶ For an overview of Audley's career, see G.E.C. i. 346-47. Audley's scant appearance on most of the witness lists of charters for the reign seem to reinforce this view. See C. Given-Wilson, 'Royal Charter Witness Lists', Medieval Prosopography, 12:2 (1991), 64-66.

⁵⁷ CPR 1334-38, 414-15. He also obviously had a claim on this title through the right of his wife. See G.E.C. i, 346.

⁵⁸ For Grosmont's early life, see K. Fowler, The King's Lieutenant: Henry of Grosmont, First Duke of Lancaster 1310-1361 (1961), 26-28.

⁵⁹ Though the younger Henry, until he came into his inheritance, also falls in with those still outside the means to fulfil their new ranks. See below, p. 21.

⁶⁰ Although notably some, such as Roger and John Beauchamp, were offshoots of noble houses. See Ormrod, Edward III, 108. For the rationale behind their inclusion, see above, p. 11 footnote 42.

in the Home Counties, but of not much previous import with king or court.⁶¹ Son and heir of Sir Reginald de Cobham,⁶² Cobham was born about 1295 and made his name primarily as a soldier,⁶³ taking part in most of the major campaigns of the reign - including those ending in the battles of Crecy and Poitiers.⁶⁴ As a result of this service, he was made knight banneret in 1339, Knight of the Garter around 1353, and was summoned to parliament from 1347 until a year before his death in 1361. Secondly, there were men who had made their names more substantially in the previous reign, either through royal service, royal favour or sometimes both. John Darcy is the principal example of this group of new creations.⁶⁵ Darcy appears to have been a loyal, and influential,⁶⁶ servant of previous regimes, having been, among other things, Constable of Norham Castle (1317); sheriff of Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire (1319-22), Lancashire (1323), Yorkshire (1327-28); and justiciar of

⁶¹ For Cobham, see Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 349-51; see also G.E.C. iii, 353.

⁶² According to Powell and Wallis, "a younger son in a family who were small landholders in south-east England since early in the thirteenth century". Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 350.

⁶³ Though he also seems to have seen a not inconsiderable amount of diplomatic service both during the Minority and in the service of Edward III. See CPR 1327-30, 300; CPR 1334-38, 388, 420-21, 428.

⁶⁴ In both battles he held positions of honour, in Crecy being one of the three guardians of the sixteen year old Prince Edward while at Poitiers he was Marshal of the Black Prince's Army. See G.E.C. iii, 353.

⁶⁵ For a fairly comprehensive overview of Darcy's life, see R.F. D'Arcy, The Life of John First Baron Darcy of Knayth (1933).

⁶⁶ Darcy felt secure enough of his position even during the Minority to make his acceptance of the chief governorship of Ireland conditional upon the fulfilment of certain demands. J. Lydon, 'The Impact of the Bruce Invasion, 1315-1327', in A. Cosgrove, ed., A New History of Ireland, vol. ii Medieval Ireland 1169-1534 (1993), 301, 394-95.

Ireland (1323-27, 1328-31).⁶⁷ As a result of this service, along with diplomatic missions to the continent,⁶⁸ in 1332, in the third parliament after the coup, he was summoned as a peer of the realm.⁶⁹ And finally, there were those who had, or whose families had, already been called to parliament and now were being further elevated to the rank of earl. The main example of this lies with four of the creations of 1337 - namely William Clinton being made Earl of Huntingdon, William Montagu being made Earl of Salisbury, Robert Ufford made earl of Suffolk, and William de Bohun made earl of Northampton - notably, the four men who helped Edward III end the minority by force in 1330.

Indeed, reflecting, as they did, the pinnacle of Edward's endowment programme, it might now be helpful now to look at the career of one of the 1337 earls in some depth in order to see what qualities the king looked for to fill the highest ranks of his nobility. A good example is that of Robert Ufford.⁷⁰ Born in 1298 to Robert de Ufford, first Lord Ufford, his first major foray into royal service was a trip

⁶⁷ For a list of his offices, see G.E.C. iv, 54-58.

⁶⁸ For example, as part of a mission to arrange for the marriage of the king's son with a daughter of the king of France in July of 1331. CPR 1330-34, 157.

⁶⁹ As shall be seen, it was usually normal for the king to patronize before he raised, though Darcy, because of his considerable previous service, seems to be an exception to this rule. That, however, he still did not have the means to sustain himself without the king's help at this point was indicated in the fact that even in 1344 the king had to grant him an annuity in lieu of his fee as justiciar of Ireland and until certain expectancies came in. See CPR 1343-45, 208.

⁷⁰ See DNB lviii, 9-13; G.E.C. xii:1, 429-32. See also J.M. Parker, 'Patronage and Service: The Careers of William Montagu, Earl of Salisbury, William Clinton, Earl of Huntingdon, Robert Ufford, Earl of Suffolk, and William Bohun, Earl of Northampton', unpublished MA thesis, University of Durham (1986), 20-22 and ff.

abroad in the company of the earl of Kent in March 1324.⁷¹ Presumably, just prior to his departure on this venture,⁷² Ufford wedded Margaret, widow of Thomas de Cailly,⁷³ the daughter of William de Norwich, a chief baron of the exchequer and his old guardian.⁷⁴ For reasons unknown, he was still abroad in August of 1325 when his attorneys were listed as gaining seisin of his mother's lands,⁷⁵ but was back by the summer of the next year at which time he was among those ordered to select twelve ships from the towns of Harwich and Ipswich, report to the Admiral of the fleet of the North, and help repel the "enemy", presumably Queen's Isabella's force, if they were to try to land.⁷⁶ After this, there is no note of Ufford being of importance to Mortimer and Isabella. The scant evidence that we do have concerning his activities in this period are mainly of those of a member of the lesser nobility, namely either fulfilling his part in the governance of the realm, as on a commission of

⁷¹ CPR 1321-24, 403-04. If, however, this was the beginning of his military career, it was not to be a very auspicious start. Kent had been sent by Edward II to take control of Gascony and protect it from any hostile moves by the French. However, instead of putting up resistance to Charles of Valois when the latter entered the duchy in August of the same year, Kent blockaded himself in the fortress of La Reole and within a month capitulated and agreed upon a truce to last until March of the following year. M. McKisack, The Fourteenth Century: 1307-1399 (1959), 109.

⁷² The DNE places the marriage between 2 July and 13 November 1324, though it seems unlikely that Ufford married after his departure.

⁷³ CCR 1327-30, 497.

⁷⁴ CPR 1313-17, 620. Though not an heiress to her father's estate, Margaret did hold the dower portion of her deceased husband's lands. CCR 1323-27, 117-18. This was helpful to Ufford as he had yet to inherit his mother's dower or indeed her inheritance.

⁷⁵ CFR 1319-27, 358.

⁷⁶ CPR 1324-27, 311, 315-16; CCR 1323-27, 643-44.

the peace in November of 1327,⁷⁷ or an oyer and terminer in September of 1328,⁷⁸ or in defence of his own interests - for example, pursuing a tenant concerning the relief of a moiety of his manor of Combs (Suffolk).⁷⁹

Rather, in this period, Ufford appeared to have become a close companion of the young king, being present on the journey to Amiens in 1329 to pay homage to the king of France for the duchy of Aquitaine.⁸⁰ In the next year, he was listed in the exchequer accounts as wearing the king's livery as a banneret.⁸¹ However, by this point he also seems to have managed to ingratiate himself with Mortimer and Isabella. Indeed, after Kent's execution in March, Ufford was given a life grant of Kent's manor of Layham (Suffolk) the farm of the town of Waltham (Essex), and the town of Dartford (Kent),⁸² as well as being granted for life the castle and town of Ufford which had been held by his father, "for his better maintenance in the king's service".⁸³ The reason for these grants is unknown, but the fact that in July of 1330 he was ordered to array the knights and other men of the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk in order "to resist the King's rebels",⁸⁴ might possibly hint at some previous service in Mortimer's struggle against Lancaster and Kent.

⁷⁷ CPR 1327-30, 214.

⁷⁸ CPR 1327-30, 351.

⁷⁹ CMR 1326-27, 187.

⁸⁰ CPR 1327-30, 388.

⁸¹ CMR 1326-27, 377.

⁸² CPR 1327-30, 517. Layham was later returned to Kent's widow in 1331. See also CCR 1330-33, 190.

⁸³ CPR 1327-30, 522; CPR 1330-34, 184.

⁸⁴ CPR 1327-30, 570-71.

As late as 3 September 1330, Ufford was still apparently in favour with the Mortimer faction, petitioning to buy the corn from his recently acquired manor of Layham.⁸⁵ Nonetheless, considering his growing association with the king, it was of little surprise that Ufford was involved in the coup of October of 1330. In this, he took one of the most active parts, killing two of the queen's bodyguards, Hugh de Turpliton and Richard de Monmouth in the fight.⁸⁶ Moreover, most of his energies seem to have been spent in the service of the king in the years following the coup. In December of 1330 he was made keeper of the forest south of Trent,⁸⁷ and in January 1331 he was made justice of the eyre of the forest in the county of Wiltshire.⁸⁸ These offices appear to have kept him out of court for a considerable period as he dealt with the duties in the counties involved.⁸⁹ In January of 1332, he was first summoned to parliament *vita patris* (life of the father) as a peer of the realm, his family having received individual summons since 1309.⁹⁰ In November of 1335, Ufford was appointed a member of an embassy to the Scots and, that having failed, campaigned against them.⁹¹ He was made steward of the household from

⁸⁵ CFR 1327-37, 189.

⁸⁶ CPR 1330-34, 74.

⁸⁷ CFR 1327-37, 206.

⁸⁸ CPR 1330-34, 66.

⁸⁹ I am going here not only from the number of commissions which Ufford was listed as being on in the Patent Rolls for the years 1331-35, but also by the fact that he was listed as witnessing no royal charters in 1332 and 1333 and only a very limited number in 1331 and 1334. See Given-Wilson, 'Royal Charter Witness Lists', 63. For Ufford's offices in this period, see Appendix 6.

⁹⁰ G.E.C. xii:2, 150-51.

⁹¹ He was also made warden of Bothwell castle at this time. DNB lviii, 10.

March 1336 to March 1337,⁹² as well as holding the office of admiral of the northern fleet between January and August of 1337.⁹³ In March of 1337, he was made earl of Suffolk for his troubles.⁹⁴

Thus personal loyalty, lack of substantial connection with the events of the previous decade, an ability in performing important offices, and an overlay of royal preference marked the principal route to the highest of rewards given out by Edward III.⁹⁵ But, though it was a wonderful idea to decide to make a royal power base within the nobility, either by elevating those already sufficiently well off to warrant parliamentary summons, or by bringing up men who proved loyal, competent supporters of Edward's kingship, it was another matter all together to ensure that the men so elevated were willing and able to serve the monarch adequately. Firstly, to keep the loyalty of those who warranted their new ranks primarily of their own accord, and who otherwise might have had little inducement against returning to traditional allegiances, it was of the utmost importance that Edward continued to show favour to them. The grant to Hugh de Audley on becoming earl of Gloucester of an

⁹² T.F. Tout, Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England (1928), iii, 37.

⁹³ He was also to hold this post in 1344. See Appendix 6.

⁹⁴ RDP lxi (1829), 741.

⁹⁵ To say, then, as Ormrod does, that "there was a worrying tendency to promote relatively humble men *purely* [my italics] because of their intimacy with the king" may be seen as overstating the case somewhat - though for Tuck to maintain that "no small group of favourites emerged" is also too strong. Perhaps the best way to look at the rise of these new men would be to say that they had certain histories and/or abilities which brought them to the notice of the king, but that whether the king decided to patronize them or not depended on his personal preference. Ormrod, Edward III, 12; Tuck, Crown and Nobility, 156.

extension to his own life of the life grant to his wife, Margaret, of the castle, manor and town of Oakham (Rutlandshire) as well as £100 annuity until an equivalent in lands or rents were granted to them,⁹⁶ though modest in comparison to what the other 1337 earls received,⁹⁷ was still probably substantial enough to keep in Audley's mind, as well as those around him, his new status as a king's man. More substantially, the grant to Henry of Grosmont of 1000 marks,⁹⁸ though only for the life of his father, was certainly enough to ensure the heir to the Lancastrian inheritance stayed well on side. Indeed Edward could no more afford to neglect such necessities as he could a balanced treatment of the 'established' nobility.

Secondly, the king had to face the far more taxing problem of ensuring that the less well off of his 'new men' had the incomes to sustain their ranks. After all, though one could perhaps get by in the established nobility without having a sufficient degree of blue blood so long as one had ability, or at the very least royal favour, it was far harder for a man to be taken seriously by the establishment who did not have a sufficient amount of income, landed or otherwise, to sustain his rank. In the words of George Holmes "in the fourteenth century, status was handled realistically; it corresponded to wealth and power".⁹⁹ This linkage between wealth and status was perhaps most clearly

⁹⁶ As well as the traditional third penny of the county of Gloucester. CPR 1334-38, 414-15.

⁹⁷ The minimum grant to endow an earl during the reign seems to have been 1000 marks. Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 37.

⁹⁸ CPR 1334-38, 400.

⁹⁹ Holmes, Estates, 4.

enunciated in the Modus Tenendi Parliamentum (The Manner of Holding Parliament), probably written in the early 1320's.¹⁰⁰ This tract not only gave specific instructions concerning how parliament should be opened and how the sessions should proceed,¹⁰¹ but also who exactly should be called from the different sections of the clergy and laity, including from the peerage:

Also there ought to be summoned and come every one of the earls and barons and their peers, that is to say those who have lands and revenues to the value of a complete earldom, that is to say twenty knight's fees of one knight, each fee being reckoned worth twenty librates which makes four hundred librates in all, or to the value of one complete barony, that is to say thirteen and a third knight's fees of one knight each fee being reckoned at twenty librates which make four hundred marks, and none of the lesser laity ought to be summoned or come to parliament, by reason of their tenure, unless their presence is for other causes useful and necessary to parliament, and then in their case it should be done as has been said concerning the lesser clergy, who are not in the least obliged to attend parliament by reason of their tenure.¹⁰²

Though the incomes indicated here as the lowest level for which one should be summoned individually would prove to be somewhat optimistic,¹⁰³ this passage nonetheless shows the growing awareness of the need of some form of economic

¹⁰⁰ For a discussion of the dating of this tract, see N. Pronay and J. Taylor, Parliamentary Texts of the Later Middle Ages (1980), 22-25.

¹⁰¹ There is no surviving evidence, however, that this tract was ever put into operation as such. Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 286.

¹⁰² As translated in Pronay and Taylor, Parliamentary Texts, 81.

¹⁰³ For a discussion of minimum incomes of barons and earls, see Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 66.

distinction, preferably in connection with land, for an individual to be called as a member of the parliamentary peerage.

It is unsurprising then, that Edward III made most of his patronage previous to, or at the very least, at the time of, an individual's actual elevation.¹⁰⁴ For it was clear that the king, if he wished his new men to have an appropriate amount of power to be taken seriously by the established nobility, had to ensure that the men he raised were approaching the means necessary to uphold their impending elevations. In the case of the grants made to the six earls in 1337, this meant promises of lands and revenues en masse to achieve this end, usually being worth around 1000 marks per annum. For those newly raised to the peerage, this also often meant large grants, such as 500 marks of land to Reginald de Cobham.¹⁰⁵ Much, indeed, depended upon what the king deemed necessary for each individual case. For example, William Bohun needed £1000 per annum to be able to sustain his rank as earl of Northampton while the other 1337 earls needed only 1000 marks.¹⁰⁶

But though such promises could be made, and other such patronage hoped for, the finding of the necessary resources

¹⁰⁴ Powell and Wallis go into the stages of the 'making' of a new man, using Reginald de Cobham as an example. See Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 349-51. Walter Manny, John and Roger Beauchamp, Guy Brian, Reginald Cobham and many others were not actually elevated to the peerage until well into their careers. Only those who were already established by the time the reign had begun - such as Roger Chaundos, Roger Kerdeston and John Leyburn - seem to have been given this dignity more quickly. Also compare Appendix 1 with the following appendices.

¹⁰⁵ CPR 1345-48, 250.

¹⁰⁶ Bohun was somewhat less well off than the other new earls. See Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 37-38.

by a king beset at the beginning of his reign with a treasury drained as a result of the extravagances of the minority regime, growing limitations on his powers as feudal overlord, and the burdens of foreign war, was altogether another issue. How Edward III was in the end able to help over thirty men in varying degrees of need to sustain the rank of peer, whether in the form of banneret or earl, and furthermore keep a somewhat larger number of more established new creations sufficiently well patronized to stay in line with royal policy is, then, the purpose of this thesis.

No one has previously treated Edward's use of patronage during his reign as a subject in itself. Though there are studies by Holmes, MacFarlane, Tuck, Given-Wilson, Ormrod, Waugh and Harriss concerning the reign, as noted previously, the first six focus on the more general position of the nobility while the latter charts the development of its role with respect to the changing concept of public finance.¹⁰⁷ McFarlane, Tuck and Given-Wilson, who have all produced studies of the English nobility in the later Middle Ages, perhaps come closest to giving an impression as to how Edward III used patronage for the sake of his new creations. But all, again, are part of larger studies, and obviously not designed to spend an extended amount of time on the issue. If, however, there is a consensus among historians, it seems to be that the purpose of Edward's treatment of and patronage to these new men was to replenish the ranks of the

¹⁰⁷ Harriss, King, Parliament, and Public Finance to 1369 (1975), *passim*.

parliamentary peerage. His elevation programme, though mainly discussed only in relation to the 1337 creations, is seen as an attempt to refill the ranks of the hereditary nobility, depleted by line failure and civil war, to a level which would enable him to fulfil his ambitions both at home and abroad.¹⁰⁸

The present study is a reassessment of this view. Working along the general lines of S.L. Waugh's work concerning royal lordship in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries,¹⁰⁹ though not nearly as ambitious in its scope, this thesis intends to examine the use of the patronage by Edward III to create a firmly royalist faction within the ranks of the English nobility. The next five chapters - those on escheats, forfeitures and expectancies (Chapter Two); marriages (Chapter Three); wardships (Chapter Four); annuities (Chapter Five); and miscellaneous patronage (Chapter Six) - examine the resources open to Edward and how he employed them, while Chapter Seven deals with contemporary reaction to this programme.

The primary sources used consist mainly of the pertinent published and unpublished materials of the Public Record Office, as well as relevant manuscripts in the British Library. Though in the case of the unpublished sources, I have tried to use everything which I felt to be relevant, in

¹⁰⁸ For example, see McFarlane, Nobility, 156-64; Tuck, Crown and Nobility, 118-19; Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 33-42. Wolffe and Ormrod also appear to accept this view by their silence with respect to any other possible scenario, though the latter does emphasize the element of favouritism in the 1337 elevations. Wolffe, Royal Demesne, 59-60; Ormrod, Edward III, 12-13, 58-59.

¹⁰⁹ S.L. Waugh, The Lordship of England: Royal Wardships and Marriages in English Society and Politics 1217-1327 (1988).

the chapter on contemporary reaction, my use of the King's Bench and Common Pleas rolls, which make up a large portion of the chapter, has had to be somewhat selective. Though I have gone through the period from the Michaelmas term of 1331 until Michaelmas 1356, which can be said to mark the main focus of Edward's patronage programme, I have, perforce through sheer bulk of material, had to restrict myself when looking through the rolls to those cases taking up half a membrane or more. Though this invariably means that I have missed considerable numbers of the starts of cases, it does nonetheless also mean that I have caught most of the more controversial suits, the ones which were not settled right away through out of court settlements. The most representative selection of these I have placed in the chapter.

One final remark should be made in regard to the organization of this thesis. In the chapters concerning the distribution of sources of patronage,¹¹⁰ I have, in general, taken the perspective of the new creations. After all, in the short run, to be of any worth, grants to a new man had to reflect his interests, and it is therefore to them that we must look to make any sort of logic out of the details of Edward's patronage. However, the king's interests obviously formed the rationale behind the system as a whole, and thus tended to dictate the overall shape and purpose of his patronage programme. Therefore, any discussion of royal advantage arising from patronage granted out has, for the

¹¹⁰ Chapters Two to Six.

most part, been left until the concluding chapter when all the pertinent material has been examined.

CHAPTER TWO

Escheats, Forfeitures, and Expectancies

At least in theory, first and foremost of Edward III's priorities in his patronage programme would have been to ensure that his new men were sufficiently well provided with land either to sustain their new ranks or to be kept content therein.¹ After all, the ownership of land was an important indicator of status in mediaeval society, and therefore a direct way in which a new man could warrant entry into, and the acceptance of, the existing nobility. However, of the most obvious sources of land for his new creations, two - the royal demesne and land obtained by purchase - can be discounted fairly quickly as viable major sources. For though the use of the royal demesne was an option in this respect, as B.P. Wolffe has shown,² the diminution of this

¹ It should be noted here that, though many of the properties granted did have some sort of traditional annual monetary payment or service attached to them, the latter was rarely of such a size that it would not still be lucrative to the new man to possess them. For an example of how lands would be granted below their valuations, which were always suspect in themselves, see Wolffe's discussion of the manor of Eastwood with the hundred of Rochford (Essex). Wolffe, Royal Demesne, 63. In some of the grants themselves, it was recognized that extents of lands - by which valuation rents and other payments were usually set - were not the true value of the lands involved. For example, see CFR 1356-68, 120; for the undervaluation of crown lands as a source of patronage for royal servants, see Wolffe, Royal Demesne, 37.

² Wolffe, Royal Demesne, 34-38, 40-51. The concept of the royal demesne is something of a quagmire, especially when it comes to deciding the nature of its composition. For the purpose of this study, the royal demesne is defined as any lands which have remained in the king's hand considerably longer than the usually limited 'turn around' time which was experienced by most escheats and forfeitures before they were granted out again. Though lacking precision, this definition does, I believe, reflect the reality of the situation during Edward III's reign. For a discussion of the debatable division between the 'permanent' and 'temporary' royal demesne, the latter of which Jewell similarly defines as "lands in the king's hand by feudal incidence", see H.M. Jewell, English Local Administration in the Middle Ages (1972), 75-80, 99-102.

resource to endow even a portion of the men involved would have impoverished the monarch and his family.³ This is not to say that there were no instances of the royal lands being used in this manner - as when the manor of Swainstone (Hampshire) was granted to William Montagu in 1331⁴ - but these were only for very special cases.⁵ Likewise, purchase was an equally unviable option, for, even if the finances were available to Edward to accomplish such a feat, according to Holmes, the land market, especially at the noble level, was quite competitive in this period.⁶ Unsurprisingly, then, unlike his use of the royal demesne, there is no evidence that the king ever went to this extreme for the sake of an endowment.

Rather, Edward first looked to his feudal rights as a possible source of peerage endowments. The obvious way was

³ Even if only twenty men in need of substantial endowment were to be funded up to the rank of banneret, this would, going on a minimum of 400 marks per annum, mean that Edward would have to have used at least 8000 marks worth of royal lands - easily the estate of a wealthy earl. According to Harriss, the yield of the royal demesne can be placed at somewhere between £10000 and £15000 per annum. Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 65-66; Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, 150; see also Wolffe, Royal Demesne, 60.

⁴ CCharR 1327-41, 210; CPR 1330-34, 54. The manor of Swainstone was granted to Prince Edward in 1312 and thus was clearly a part of the king's own lands. VCH: Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, 219. Furthermore, on only one occasion - the grant, during pleasure, of the manor of Stoke Trister to Guy de Brian in 1344 - were chamber lands used as a source of patronage to Edward's new creations. CFR 1337-47, 378.

⁵ Montagu was probably the individual closest to Edward III. For a brief overview of his career, see G.E.C, xi, 385-88; DNB xxxviii, 212-13; R. Douch, 'The Career, Lands and Family of William Montague, Earl of Salisbury, 1301-44', BIHR xxiv (1951), 85-88.

⁶ Holmes, Estates (1957), 7-8; see also McFarlane, Nobility, 53, 55. Though it should be noted that the market was still open enough for the king himself to buy a number of lands throughout his reign. See C. Given-Wilson, 'Richard II and his Grandfather's Will', EHR lxxxiii (1978), 320-37.

though gifts of property which had come back, or were to come back, into the king's hands. There were three main types of grant which the king could make from this source - grant on account of escheat (including all 'ordinary return' of lands into the king's hands), grants as a result of forfeiture or other involuntary surrender, and grants in expectancy.

i) Escheats

Escheat was probably the most well known of royal rights from which a grant could be made. In essence, if anyone holding lands of the king died without heirs, or otherwise came to the end of his term of tenancy, the lands involved would return once more to royal custody and, unless they were reserved for the royal demesne by custom or by specification, would then be open to be granted out again.⁷ This source, however, has to be carefully defined, for it often denoted both normal and extraordinary return of lands to the king.⁸ For this discussion, escheat means any lands

⁷ F. Pollock and F.W. Maitland, The History of English Law Before the Time of Edward I (1968), i: 351; A.W.B. Simpson, An Introduction to the History of the Land Law (1961), 19.

⁸ See J.G. Bellamy, Law of Treason in England in the Later Middle Ages (1970), 80. Simpson divided escheat into two categories - escheat through lack of heirs, called escheat *propter defectum sanguinis*, and escheat *propter delictum tenentis*, when lands came back to the king as a result of felony. Forfeiture, and lands otherwise taken by force back into the king's hand, were also considered a type of escheat in many writs, usually denoted by the phrase "escheats by forfeiture". Simpson, History of Land Law, 19. However, since the reasons behind the return of such lands into the king's hand differed greatly from ordinary workings of feudal tenure, and because there were developments in the forfeiture and felony laws in this period, this issue will be treated separately in section iii of this chapter.

which had come back into the king's hands through the ordinary operation of feudal tenure. As a result, there are four potential sources of escheat - lands which had come back to the king as a result of there being no heirs to an estate held in fee simple; lands returning because there were no heirs to an estate held in tail, and especially tail male; lands returning as a result of the end of life grants or leases; and lands voluntarily surrendered to the king by an individual.

Simple escheat of tenures held in fee, while being perhaps the most obvious way in which land could come back to the king, in actuality was far from common. Indeed, the chance that all heirs to an estate held in fee simple had died off was very rare.⁹ Though the Statute of *Quia Emptores* (1290) started a process whereby the number of individuals holding in tenancy-in-chief could not help but grow due to the fact that no new permanent tenures could be created on land held in fee,¹⁰ the fact still remained that there was usually a number of collateral claimants to any lands held in this manner. Hence it is unsurprising that there were no recorded grants to Edward's new creations of any lands so held.

However, the escheat of lands entailed, and especially those held in tail male, was another matter. Used to control the descent of an estate, and especially to prevent its dispersal amongst female heirs, tail male meant that only

⁹ See 'Appendix B: The Rate of Extinction of Noble Families' in McFarlane, *Nobility*, 172.

¹⁰ Resulting in the state of affairs that, by the Tudor period, "mesne lordships had become uncommon". Simpson, *History of the Land Law*, 23.

the male issue in the direct line could gain control of the land so granted.¹¹ Otherwise it would escheat to the original grantor - in cases of tenants-in-chief, the king.¹² And, as we have seen in Chapter One, families of this social stratum had the tendency to die out in the later Middle Ages in the male line,¹³ often resulting in no legitimate heir whatsoever. Indeed, though not as popular as previously thought,¹⁴ tail male grants were nevertheless helpful as a source for Edward's patronage programme, the main example being those lands coming back to the king as the result of the death of John of Eltham, earl of Cornwall and the king's brother. Granted to Eltham during the minority of Edward III,¹⁵ this earldom had been in the king's hands since the death of Piers de Gaveston in 1312. Eltham subsequently died while on campaign in Scotland in 1336, and, having no male heirs, the earldom, and lands connected with it, returned to

¹¹ McFarlane, Nobility, 136. Though there seems to have been a variation on this type of grant which was often used by those holding of the king - rather than the king himself - which allowed for a greater number of potential heirs. See p. 207 footnote 7.

¹² For a discussion of the impact of entail, tail male, and other estate preserving devices, see Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 139-53.

¹³ McFarlane calculated the extinction rate in the male line between 1300-1500 as being about 27 per cent every 25 years, though it was at its lowest point, 23.5 per cent, in the period 1325-50. McFarlane, Nobility, 144-45. Given-Wilson thinks these rates might be somewhat exaggerated due to McFarlane's inclusion of "'theoretical' extinctions". See Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 59-60, 64.

¹⁴ Payling has recently argued that entail was far more prevalent than tail male in the later Middle Ages. See S. Payling, 'Social Mobility, Demographic Change, and Landed Society in Late Medieval England', ECHR xlv:1 (1992), 57.

¹⁵ This was granted at the same time as Mortimer was made earl of March, thus perhaps illustrating the favour with which the minority regime held Eltham. See Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 301.

the king.¹⁶ Though most of this then went to permanently endow Prince Edward on becoming duke of Cornwall in 1337,¹⁷ some of the estate also proved a boon for Edward's new men. For example, on 16 March 1337, Reginald de Cobham was granted the earl's manor of Chippenham in Wiltshire, said to be worth £64 yearly, as part of a 400 mark promise of lands and rents granted by the king the previous January.¹⁸ More importantly, the estates of the dead earl were also used quite liberally in the 1337 endowments. William Clinton, on becoming earl of Huntingdon, was given the manor of Kirton (Lincolnshire),¹⁹ worth 500 marks per annum, while Robert de Ufford, elevated to the earldom of Suffolk, was granted the castle, town, manor and honour of Eye, the manor of Thorndon, the manor of Hanley, and the hundreds of Hartismere and Stowe (Suffolk) as well as the manor of Cawston (Norfolk) -²⁰ much of which, previous to coming into John of Eltham's hands, had been granted to Queen Isabella in 1319.²¹

¹⁶ See also Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 34-35. There were hints and accusations by some chroniclers that the king had killed Eltham at Perth after a quarrel, though Prestwich does not believe these hold much weight. M. Prestwich, The Three Edwards: War and State in England 1272-1377 (1980), 241.

¹⁷ Wolffe, Royal Demesne, 54, 57.

¹⁸ Given with the assent of parliament and under the king's seal, this manor had originally been sold by Joan de Ferrers to Richard, earl of Cornwall in 1252 for £200. Upon the death of Edmund, earl of Cornwall, his son, in 1300, it came back to Edward I and was then granted by his son to Piers de Gaveston. After the latter's death in 1312, the king took the manor back into his hands until it was again granted out to John of Eltham in tail male in 1330. CPR 1334-38, 346, 401; CPR 1338-40, 310-11; VCH: Buckinghamshire, iii, 173-74; Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 350.

¹⁹ CPR 1334-38, 409-10, 415.

²⁰ CPR 1334-38, 418; CCR 1337-39, 60-61.

²¹ Wolffe, Royal Demesne, 231.

Thirdly, there were lands which had returned to the king through the end of life or limited term grants and which were therefore open for use for patronage to Edward's new creations. A routine example was the use made by Edward III of the estate of Thomas de Poynings.²² From this estate, two new creations gained holdings. One, Reginald de Cobham, was granted on 12 January 1339, for life "the king's mills beneath the castle of Oxford, and his meadow there called 'Kyngesmede,'" which Poynings held of a life grant. The other, in October of the same year, was a grant in fee, to Thomas Bradeston, of the manor of Shalford (Surrey), which had also been held for life by Poynings.²³ There was also a number of life grants made during the 1320's, probably as a result of the unsettled nature of the times, which now began to come in - sometimes to the benefit of some of Edward's new creations. The manors of Fulmer and Datchet, originally held by Henry, then Edmund, de Pynkeney in fee, were just such cases. In 1321, probably under duress, Edmund Pynkeney granted the manors to Hugh Despenser the elder,²⁴ which remained in Despensers' hands until his final forfeiture in 1326, after which they were regranted for life to Pynkeney.²⁵ Upon his death in 1331, these lands were again granted out

²² It is somewhat surprising that these lands were not regranted to Thomas's son, Michael, later raised to the peerage in 1348, though this probably had something to do with the fact that the latter was still underage, and more importantly relatively untried, at the time of his father's death. CPR 1338-40, 395.

²³ CPR 1338-40, 399.

²⁴ Though they returned to him briefly during the exile of Despenser. Fryde, Tyranny and Fall, 30.

²⁵ CIPM vii, 324-25; Fryde, Tyranny and Fall, 30-31. Tout, however, notes that Fulmer was administered by the Chamber in the period 1321-26. Tout, Chapters, ii, 351-52.

to William Montagu, Fulmer being entailed while Datchet was granted in fee.²⁶

Most rarely, voluntary surrender of lands was also a form of escheat from which Edward III's new creations stood to gain. Though there were only a few of these which could really be viewed as such - the majority of surrenders being forced by the king -²⁷ there was one exceptional case. On 9 September 1332, William Bohun was the recipient of a grant for his good service to the king of the manors of Hinton and Spene (Berkshire), Haseley, Ascot, Deddington, Pyrton, and Kirtlington (Oxfordshire), the town and manor of Wycombe (Buckinghamshire), the manors of Long Bennington (Lincolnshire), Kneesul (Nottinghamshire), Newnham (Gloucestershire), Wix (Essex), and a farm of £42 from the manor of Bosham (Sussex), to hold for himself and the heirs of his body.²⁸ These lands had come into the king's hands through the surrender of the king's uncle, Thomas, earl of Norfolk - who, though something of a favourite of the previous regime, does not seem to have been forced to give up the lands involved.²⁹

²⁶ CCharR 1327-41, 210, 328; CPR 1330-34, 54.

²⁷ For example, Queen Isabella's estate after the 1330 coup. See section ii.

²⁸ Rendering £800 per annum for the estate. CFR 1327-37, 323-24.

²⁹ These were mainly lands from the forfeited Despenser estate which, in 1327, had been granted to Brotherton. CCharR 1327-41, 3-4. There was no reason given for the surrender, though Holmes has found evidence that it was with Norfolk's approval. Holmes, Estates, 23, footnote 1. Prestwich and Given-Wilson, however, see Thomas of Brotherton as being somewhat out of favour by the early 1330's. Prestwich, Three Edwards, 157; Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 34.

ii) Forfeitures

Another part of Edward's land grants to his new creations were those of forfeited properties, rights and rents.³⁰ There may, in essence, be seen to be three causes of forfeiture - domestic politics, war, and criminal law transgressions.³¹ Previous to the reign of Edward III, the right of forfeiture due to domestic political causes had seldom been a major source of royal patronage.³² Though Edward II had exercised this right after the rebellion of 1322 to patronize the Despensers, most of the confiscated Contrariants' estates nonetheless went straight into royal custody, to be exploited either through direct cultivation or leasing.³³ Moreover, in the only other major case of mass domestic forfeiture used for patronage purposes in the preceding two centuries-³⁴ namely, the estates of the

³⁰ A number of the grants made through lands escheated by the end of limited term or life tenures also had the process of forfeiture in their background, for example the grant to Thomas Ughtred in 1338 of two parts of a messuage in Petergate, York, a property forfeited by Michael de Harclay in the last reign and then granted for life to Nicholas de Hugate. CPR 1338-40, 104. Most of this type of property has been dealt in section i.

³¹ For a more detailed discussion of the different types of forfeiture, see Bellamy, Law of Treason, passim.

³² I am diverging somewhat from Ormrod here, though he only gives Edward II's patronage to the Despensers as evidence of previous royal policy on this point. Ormrod, Edward III, 58.

³³ Waugh 'The Confiscated Lands of the Contrariants', 13-14. According to Fryde, "Edward retained the bulk of the lands of dead Contrariants, including especially almost all of Lancaster's properties, and most of the lands of those who remained alive, in prison or in exile". Fryde, Tyranny and Fall, 109.

³⁴ There was also the case of the ecclesiastical lands confiscated by John before the start of the Interdict, but many of these were quickly given back to their original holders or simply held by keepers paying receipts into the chamber or, later, the exchequer. See C.R. Cheney, 'King John's Reaction to the Interdict on England', TRHS 4th ser. xxxi(1949), 149-50; Waugh, 'The Confiscated Lands of the 'Contrariants'', 14.

Montfortians in 1265 - arrangements for the return of most of the lands involved had been made within three years.³⁵ Only when one goes back to the first quarter of the twelfth century, a time when the hereditary principle was still being worked out,³⁶ does one find domestic political forfeiture used as a major source of patronage.³⁷ Indeed, Henry I's efforts to endow his 'new men', mainly through the forfeited lands of the followers of Robert Curthose,³⁸ was the last substantial use of lands confiscated for political reasons as a source of patronage before the fourteenth century.³⁹

However, to Edward III, lands resulting from political forfeitures were very helpful, especially in the drive to endow his 'new men'. There may be seen to be two types of lands forfeited for domestic political reasons which were

³⁵ C.H. Knowles, 'The Resettlement of England after the Barons' War, 1264-67', TRHS 5th ser., xxxii (1982), 30. According to Knowles, "the pivotal idea of the Dictum of Kenilworth was the rejection of the policy of total forfeiture in favour of redemption at fixed terms". Knowles, 'Resettlement of England', 29.

³⁶ R.H.C. Davis, 'What Happened in Stephen's Reign', History xlix (1964), 5-8; R. DeAragon, 'The Growth of Secure Inheritance in Anglo-Norman England', JMH 8 (1982), 381-91.

³⁷ R.V. Turner, Men Raised From the Dust: Administrative Service and Upward Mobility in Angevin England (1988), 5-6. On the changing face of forfeiture in the twelfth century, see J.E. Lally, 'Secular Patronage in the Court of King Henry II', BIHR xxxix, (1976), 159-63.

³⁸ C.A. Newman, The Anglo-Norman Nobility in the Reign of Henry I: The Second Generation (1988), 114-18. According to Hollister, "forfeitures of English lands under Henry I virtually ceased after 1114". Hollister, 'The Aristocracy', in E. King, ed., The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign (1994), 45.

³⁹ It should be noted that though the creations of the Anarchy were endowed to a certain degree, most of those involved were of substantial wealth previous to their rise to earldoms, and much of the land which was used for patronage was from the lands formerly of the royal demesne. See D. Crouch, The Image of the Aristocracy in Britain: 1000-1300 (1992), 64; Hollister, 'The Aristocracy', 60-61.

then used by the king in order to patronize his new creations: forfeited lands as a result of the troubles during the reign of Edward II and those forfeited after the fall of Isabella and Mortimer.⁴⁰ The forfeited lands resulting from Edward II's problems during the 1320's and used by Edward III as a source of patronage were, almost to a manor, from the estate of the Despensers.⁴¹ While many of the participants in the troubles of the previous reign seem to have been able to make their peace, either with the minority regime in the Parliament of 1327,⁴² or soon after the 1330 coup,⁴³ the Despenser heirs were continuously singled out for harsh treatment,⁴⁴ probably in recompense for

⁴⁰ There was, however, one other major grant which does not fit into either of these categories. In August of 1348, Ralph Stafford and Richard Talbot were granted the keeping of the estate of Maurice, earl of Desmond, which had come into the king's hands as a result of Desmond's part in the reaction against the royal resumption of lands and offices in Ireland in 1341 - obviously an offshoot of the 1340-41 parliamentary crisis. The lands were, however, restored to Desmond in November 1349 with all issues since his initial forfeiture. CFR 1347-56, 93; G.E.C. iv, 93.

⁴¹ The records of the first decade of the reign, it has been noted by Ault, make numerous mentions of the estates of the Despensers, as well as that of Thomas of Lancaster, "though the misfortunes of those great barons were events of the previous reign". W.O. Ault, 'Manors and Temporalities', in J.F. Willard, W.A. Morris, and W.H. Dunham, eds., The English Government at Work (1950), iii, 3.

⁴² For example, RP ii, 3-5. For a brief summary of the settlement after 1330 of the estates of the combatants of the 1320's, see Tuck, Crown and Nobility, 103-04.

⁴³ For example, Oliver de Ingham - though this reconciliation was not without a price. See p. 154 footnote 60.

⁴⁴ According to Davies, on the accession of Edward III, complaints against Hugh the Younger, especially concerning his acquisitiveness of 'Contrariant' estates, were welcomed by the new regime. J.C. Davies, The Baronial Opposition to Edward II: Its Character and Policy (1967), 97. Hugh, son of Hugh Despenser the younger, did, however, start to come back into favour with Edward III in the latter half of the 1330's, as witness the 1337 grant to him of a number of his father's manors and lands in Devon, Hampshire, Leicestershire, Surrey, Sussex and Wiltshire. CPR 1334-38, 461-62.

the treatment both Hughs had meted out to the country as a whole.⁴⁵ Aside from grants to Isabella, Mortimer, and some of those who helped them in the invasions,⁴⁶ a not insubstantial portion of the Despenser estate seems to have gone into limbo during the Minority, the regime seemingly loathe to grant such lands to the heirs of the family, yet also unwilling to alienate them permanently elsewhere. Sometimes, if the result of Despenser acquisitiveness, they were given back to their original owners, though often only for life.⁴⁷ More often, though, they were unlawfully entered on by these individuals after the fall of the Despensers in 1326 and became a focal point for dispute during the Minority.

Such was the case with Marston Meysy (Wiltshire). This manor had been held by John de Meysy during the reign of Edward I, but he was forced to give it up to Hugh Despenser the elder.⁴⁸ When Despenser forfeited in 1326, it appears to have been entered into again by Meysy, an act to be confirmed by the king in 1329.⁴⁹ However, his hold on this was in no way firm, for in March of 1332, John Darcy was granted, for his better maintenance, the manors of Marston Meysy and Wyke-Valors by Marston Meysy, both properties

⁴⁵ For a discussion of the Despensers' strong arm tactics, see Fryde, Tyranny and Fall, 106-18.

⁴⁶ Fryde, Tyranny and Fall, 208. For grants to Edmund, earl of Kent, and Thomas de Brotherton, earl of Norfolk, see CCR 1327-41, 2-5.

⁴⁷ See example of Pynkeney in section i.

⁴⁸ For a summary of the events in the 1320's, see CCR 1327-30, 495-96; CP40/360/94ff. For a fuller discussion of this case, see pp. 177-78.

⁴⁹ CCR 1327-30, 495-96

previously held by the elder Despenser, to hold for life, rent free.⁵⁰

Indeed, whatever their previous histories, Despenser lands seem to have been a useful fund of patronage. Another of Edward's new creations, Roger Swynnerton, was also made a series of grants of Despenser lands - in this case a continuation of a policy of patronage of the Minority regime.⁵¹ In 1331, he was granted all the knights' fees and advowsons of churches belonging to his lands, often originally of the Despenser estate, in the counties of Staffordshire and Cheshire.⁵² In December of 1333, he was further granted, during pleasure, the manor of Little Barrow (Cheshire), late of Hugh le Despenser the younger,⁵³ and in July of 1334 the elder Despenser's manor of Barrow (Cheshire) and Despenser lands and rents in Rushton, Corneford, Alstonfield and Caldon (Staffordshire) were given to him in fee.⁵⁴ Finally, ending this series of grants, on 25

⁵⁰ At first granted on 20 August 1331 during pleasure, this was then regranted for life 25 March 1332 in recompense for other lands taken out of his control. In February of 1338 it was granted that the manor should remain to John Darcy 'le fitz' for life after the death of Darcy. CPR 1330-34, 165, 268; CPR 1338-40, 16.

⁵¹ CPR 1327-37, 7-8; CPR 1327-30, 33. It has been suggested by Morgan that these grants were the result of Swynnerton's connections with Ralph Stafford, a supporter of Edward III in the overthrow of Roger Mortimer - though Hilton places them on opposite sides during the reign of Edward II. R.H. Hilton, The English Peasantry in the Later Middle Ages (1975), 241; P. Morgan, War and Society in Medieval Cheshire: 1277-1403 (1987), 55.

⁵² CPR 1330-34, 56.

⁵³ CPR 1327-37, 381. I have been unable to determine the fate of this manor during the Minority, though it was obviously separate from the manor of Barrow, which was held by the elder Despenser.

⁵⁴ CPR 1330-34, 569. This, along with all the other lands of Hugh Despenser the Elder in Stafford and Cheshire, he had originally been granted "during pleasure" in 1327. The grant of the manor of Barrow, at least, seems to have been changed

September 1334, Swynnerton was granted the manor of Little Barrow in fee, without payment of any rent.⁵⁵

Also important were the forfeitures resulting from the Nottingham coup of 1330. Though many of the lands of Roger Mortimer tended, according to Holmes, to remain either in the king's hands or be leased out, some were nonetheless granted away as patronage during the first half of the reign, not a few of which made their way to Edward's new men.⁵⁶ Most notably, William Montagu was granted, as part of £1000 of land in 1331, one of the most important parts of the Mortimer inheritance, the lordship of Denbigh, and the cantreds of Rhos, Rhyfniog, and Carmarthen, and the commote of Dinmael.⁵⁷ Worth over 1000 marks per annum to Montagu, this lordship was forfeited by Lancaster in 1322, then granted to Hugh Despenser the elder, who in turn forfeited it in 1326 when it came into Mortimer's hands.⁵⁸ Others who benefited from Mortimer's fall included John Darcy who, in 1335, was granted the manors of Rathwer and Kildalk in Ireland in fee and tail male respectively,⁵⁹ and Hugh Frene,

to a life grant later on in the Minority. CPR 1327-30, 331; CFR 1327-37, 7-8; CPR 1330-34, 50, 569; CPR 1330-34, 50. This manor had originally been promised by Edward II to the Earl of Norfolk, who then had to petition for other compensation. CPR 1330-34, 50.

⁵⁵ CPR 1334-38, 21. For a history of this manor in the 1320's, see KB27/301/48 ff.

⁵⁶ For a discussion of the Mortimer estate in the reign of Edward III, see Holmes, Estates, 14-18.

⁵⁷ CChar 1327-41, 199, 210; CCR 1330-1333, 115.

⁵⁸ The castle of Denbigh was originally built by Henry de Lacy, Earl of Lincoln, in the late thirteenth century. An Inventory of the Ancient Monuments in Wales and Monmouthshire vol. iv, County of Denbigh (1914), 39; Survey of the Honour of Denbigh: 1334, eds. P. Vinogradoff and F. Morgan (1914), xii-xiv. It was worth a total of £1000 per annum. Holmes, Estates, 97.

⁵⁹ CPR 1334-38, 94.

given the keeping, though only until further order, of Mortimer's manors of Marden, Bredwardine and Winforton in 1331.⁶⁰

Unsurprisingly, Isabella, as the king's mother, was treated far more leniently than Mortimer after October 1330,⁶¹ though she was still forced to give up the majority of her estate.⁶² Some of it went, on account of his part in the coup, to Robert de Ufford. On 24 January 1331, he was granted the manors of Gravesend (Kent) and Burgh (Norfolk) in tail male.⁶³ Montagu also received lands in this period, namely the manors of Christchurch Twynham, Westover and Ringwood (Hampshire), Crookham (Berkshire) and Catford in Levesham (Kent), all previously held by Isabella.⁶⁴ It is notable that some of these manors had also, like the honour of Denbigh, once been in the hands of the Despensers, and had been granted to Isabella just after the usurpation.⁶⁵ Isabella's estate would continue to be of importance

⁶⁰ CFR 1327-37, 237.

⁶¹ In a restitution to her in September of 1334 of the counties of Ponthieu and Montreuil, it was stated that the grant was made "in remembrance of the divine precept that sons should reverence their parents and of filial duty, and that she may have such increase of honour as becomes her estate". CPR 1334-38, 24.

⁶² She was granted £3000 per annum in 1331, but this was increased to £4500 in 1337. P.C. Doherty, 'Isabella Queen of England 1296-1330', unpublished D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford (1977), 325. For an inventory of Isabella's estate up to 1330, see Wolffe, Royal Demesne, 230-36.

⁶³ CPR 1327-30, 67.

⁶⁴ CCharR 1327-41, 210; CPR 1330-34, 54. Christchurch Twynham, Westover and Ringwood (Hampshire) were all part of the dower originally given to Queen Margaret. Edward II assigned them to Isabella in 1318. VCH: Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, iv, 608; v, 92.

⁶⁵ See Wolffe, Royal Demesne, 232-34. As had the surrendered lands of Thomas de Brotherton, Earl of Norfolk. See section i.

throughout the 1330's, though later it was through the use of reversionary rights.⁶⁶

Even the estates of a henchman of the minority government could be of use as a source of patronage. John Maltravers, a favourite of the previous regime, now accused of helping cause the death of the king's father, had all his lands forfeited on Edward's assumption of personal rule in 1330.⁶⁷ For the next twenty years, these lands, spread throughout southern England and Wales, were to be a constant source of patronage for Edward.⁶⁸ Though only one of Edward's new creations gained anything of importance from this estate,⁶⁹ to him it was nonetheless a major acquisition. John de Wilington, an older member of the new peerage,⁷⁰ was granted the castle of Carreg Cennan together with the commote of Is Cennan (Carmarthenshire) in 1337,⁷¹ a substantial lordship in southwest Wales which would later find its way into the hands of Henry of Grosmont in 1340.⁷²

Most of such grants, however, were used up by the latter half of the decade on Edward's more pressing endowment

⁶⁶ See section iii.

⁶⁷ CFR 1327-37, 207.

⁶⁸ For example, grants to Robert de Wodehous, Robert Bullok and Richard de Grey. See CFR 1327-37, 224, 233, 287.

⁶⁹ Though Robert de Ufford was granted a house of the Maltravers estate called "le Bas court" by Cripplegate in London. He was first only granted it for a limited term, but it was later changed to tail male, and later still, into an "in fee" grant. CPR 1330-34, 73, 106; CPR 1340-43, 201.

⁷⁰ As Wilington was summoned to fight against the Welsh in 1294, he must have been born at some point during the 1270's. See G.E.C. xii:2, 646-48.

⁷¹ CPR 1334-38, 561; For a valuation, see KB27/313/24.

⁷² Through a demise by the son of Wilington, Ralph. See R. Somerville, History of the Duchy of Lancaster (1953), vol. i (1265-1603), 38; CPR 1338-40, 549; for a more detailed description of the history of this lordship, see Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 313; and below pp. 179-82.

cases.⁷³ Luckily, one of the advantages of starting a war is that one is then allowed to confiscate any enemy property in one's kingdom. Hence, the wars with the Scots and the French were also an important source of forfeited land. These were potentially easier to procure for the king than forfeitures connected with domestic transgressions for, as Bellamy states, forfeiture by reason of war was "a penalty which resulted from a treason which was different than other treasons in that it did not necessarily originate in a verdict in a court."⁷⁴ In the Scottish case, by 1333, Edward had decided that the "Shameful Peace"(1328), which he had been forced to agree to by Mortimer and Isabella, was no longer valid. Instead, he at first secretly, and then openly, started to back the "Disinherited", the Scottish lords who had lost their lands by the rise of Bruce to the throne. As a result, many Scots who held lands in England as well as some English lords who had decided to throw in their lot with the Scots, forfeited - thereby adding to Edward's fund of patronage.⁷⁵ For example, on 1 April 1335, with the agreement of the council, Walter de Manny was granted in fee the manor of Beachington (Buckinghamshire), which the king

⁷³ Even Wilington may be seen as an important focus for patronage, having been thoroughly anti-royalist in the troubles of the early 1320's, later a firm supporter of the Mortimer regime, and thus an important man to keep content - especially considering his position in Wales and the southwest. See G.E.C. xii:2, 646-47; Fryde, Tyranny and Fall, 72, 75; Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 313.

⁷⁴ Bellamy, Law of Treason, 81.

⁷⁵ These mainly show up on the Scottish rolls as either grants directly by Edward III or by the 'pseudo-king' (pseudoregem) Edward de Balliol - though obviously in the latter case the English king had the last say in these matters, as witness his confirmation of the grants made. See Rotuli Scotiae i, 273-74, 379-80, 675.

held by the forfeiture of David de Strabolgi, earl of Atholl.⁷⁶ Three days later, he was further granted the manors of Stiffkey and Holkham (Norfolk), both again from the earl of Atholl's English lands.⁷⁷ Similarly, lands in Scotland were also of use as a source of patronage. Thomas Ughtred's 1333 grant of the estate of the Scottish knight John Stiward, including the manor of Bonkill (Berwickshire),⁷⁸ ostensibly made by Edward de Balliol, but in actually an act of patronage by Edward III, was one of a number of such grants made in the mid 1330's,⁷⁹ especially to those who seen active service in Scotland.⁸⁰ Finally, as a result of changes in the concept of treason,⁸¹ some of the forfeited lands of those northern landholders believed to be collaborating with the Scots were also granted out to Edward's men - as seen in the grant to William Heron, though for a fine of 200 marks, of forfeited lands of Roger de Aulton, Isabel de Cornhale, William de Prendergest, and Thomas de Gosewyk, all found guilty of 'adhering' to the Scots.⁸²

⁷⁶ CPR 1334-38, 89.

⁷⁷ CPR 1334-38, 89-91; CCR 1333-37, 392.

⁷⁸ Referred to in The Complete Peerage as a "barony". G.E.C xii:2, 159

⁷⁹ For other cases, see p. 44 footnote 75.

⁸⁰ Ughtred first saw service in Scotland in 1314, negotiating for the release of William Latimer, one of the English lords captured at Bannockburn. He was with the 'Disinherited' at Dupplin Moor in 1332. G.E.C xii:2, 158-59.

⁸¹ See C.J. Neville, 'The Law of Treason in the English Border Counties in the Later Middle Ages', Law and History Review 9:1 (1991), esp. 3-7.

⁸² CPR 1348-50, 208-09. Fine paid in full 2 May 1349.

E401/397. Prendergest was, moreover, indicted for 'treasonous' activity in 1357. Neville, 'Law of Treason', 9. It should also be noted that Edward III began a practice during his reign whereby men were being attainted for treason after their deaths - in particular concerning the crime of adhering to the Scots in cases going back to Edward I's reign - and the lands of their successors held as forfeit. Though there are no identifiable examples of such

But the bulk of war forfeiture grants came with Edward III's declaration of hostilities against the French king, Philip VI, in 1337. A couple of these were from the capture of enemy land such as the grant to Henry of Grosmont of the lordship of Bergerac in 1347.⁸³ But large scale granting of French lands was not to be an important issue until the reign of Henry V.⁸⁴ Rather, it was the English possessions of French subjects which were the more useful in this respect. Of the more substantial grants, Hugh de Audley, to whom was due a £100 land grant, in 1337 gained from the forfeit of Robert de Stuteville,⁸⁵ which included the manors of Eckington (Derbyshire) and Kirkby in Ashfield (Nottinghamshire), granted to him in tail male, with the remainders granted to John Darcy in 1340.⁸⁶ At the same time, Darcy also received the manors of Louth and Balyogary and all other lands in Ireland in fee, late of the Count of Eu, and again forfeit because of the war with France.⁸⁷ Moreover, Darcy was not the only one to gain at the Count's expense. In October of 1337, Henry of Grosmont had part of his 1000 mark annuity replaced with the manors of Wighton (Norfolk),

lands being used for endowments, it is just another indication as to how far Edward III was adjusting the scope of forfeiture during his reign. On this practice, see Bellamy, Law of Treason, 90.

⁸³ CPR 1345-48, 542. Somerville, Duchy of Lancaster, 39-40, 53. On the taking of Bergerac, see Fowler, King's Lieutenant, 56-61;

⁸⁴ See G.L. Harriss, 'The King and his Magnates', in G.L. Harriss, ed., Henry V: The Practice of Kingship (1975; 2nd edition 1993), 44-45.

⁸⁵ In the Issue Rolls it was noted that John de Stuteville was "from Norman parts". E403/302 (23 November 1338).

⁸⁶ CPR 1338-40, 441-42, 458-59.

⁸⁷ CPR 1338-40, 441-42, 458-59.

and Laughton-en-le-Morthen (Yorkshire), in total worth £72. 7s. 6d. yearly, previously held in chief by the Count.⁸⁸

But by far the most important implications of the war with France lay with the lands of the alien religious in England.⁸⁹ Confiscated in July 1337,⁹⁰ 'alien priories', as they were then called, had been faced with exploitation throughout the later Middle Ages, most systematically after Edward I's seizure of all foreign ecclesiastical property in 1295.⁹¹ That king, according to Alison McHardy, "devised the system whereby they (the alien religious lands) were exploited to the crown's profit with a minimum of effort by its own servants", a system which was to be used, with some developments, thereafter when hostilities with the French were on.⁹² To Edward III, however, she gives a "harsh, muddled and inefficient" approach to the issue, though at the same time acknowledging that he, and Richard II, had developed previous policy considerably.⁹³ What she does not give to Edward is any originality in dealing with the issue.

⁸⁸ CPR 1334-38, 538.

⁸⁹ For a discussion of alien priories in this period, see A. McHardy, 'The Effects of War on the Church: The Case of the Alien Priories in the Fourteenth Century', in M. Jones and M. Vale, eds., England and Her Neighbours 1066-1453: Essays in Honour of Pierre Chaplais (1989), 277-95; M.M. Morgan, 'The Suppression of the Alien Priories', History, 26 (1941), 204-12. For a more general discussion of alien religious lands in England in the Middle Ages, see D. Matthew, Norman Monasteries and their English Possessions (1962).

⁹⁰ Matthew, Norman Monasteries, 90. The later justification for this by William of Ockham, as paraphrased by Wright, was that "even the possessions of the church could be confiscated by the crown when needed for public defence". J.R. Wright, The Church and the English Crown 1305-1334: A Study based on the Register of Archbishop Walter Reynolds (1980), 242.

⁹¹ McHardy, 'Effects of War', 278-79; Matthew, Norman Monasteries, 81.

⁹² McHardy, 'Effects of War', 279.

⁹³ McHardy, 'Effects of War', 279.

And yet Edward was, in at least one way, an innovator in royal policy towards alien priories. He appears to have been the first king to have used such lands extensively as a source of patronage to favourites. Nowhere in the administrative records, or in secondary literature for the period, is there any previous mention of a like policy to exploit an obviously lucrative source of property.⁹⁴ Part of this exploitation took the form of inflated farms of alien religious lands which were then used in the payment of annuities.⁹⁵ But annuities were not the only way in which the alien priories could be utilized to provide endowment patronage. Edward's men were also granted the keeping of alien lands directly, using part or all of the estates of twelve alien houses in the period 1338-59 for the sake of six of his new creations. An early example is when, in 1338, Reginald de Cobham was granted the manors of West Preston and Hoo (Sussex) of the Benedictine priory of Ogbourne St George (Wiltshire).⁹⁶ Later, in 1349, Roger Beauchamp was

⁹⁴ When confiscated in 1295, the guardians of alien religious lands were ordered to "answer fully at the exchequer for all issues of all lands, rents, churches, pensions and other profits whereof the said monks are now seised". And, though in the 1324 confiscation, according to Matthew, the revenues from these properties were "divided evenly amongst the monks, the guardians, and the exchequer" - though how equitable this division was under the Despenser administration is obviously open to question - this was still far from the full scale grants of Edward III's reign. CFR 1272-1307, 363-64; Matthew, Norman Monasteries, 88.

⁹⁵ See below, pp. 123-25. See also McHardy, 'Effects of War', 281-83.

⁹⁶ Administrative centre of the temporalities of the alien abbot of Bec Hellouin, according to Knowles and Hadcock. Originally confiscated on the outbreak of war with France, but then granted back to the prior for a hefty annual farm of £530, which would, in 1350, rise to 1000 marks per annum. The willingness to pay such amounts was mainly due to a growing fear of wastage in the same lay custody. CFR 1337-47, 100; CCR 1339-41, 544; D. Knowles and R.N. Hadcock,

given the keeping of the manors of Aston on Carrant and Ashton (Gloucestershire), apparently previously directly controlled by the alien abbot of Beaubec.⁹⁷ But it was not just parts of an alien priory's lands which were granted. Often it was the whole priory, such as grants of the priories of Lapley and Newent to the earl of Derby and Lewisham and Greenwich to John de Beauchamp indicate.⁹⁸ In one case, all the English lands of a foreign abbey, that of Lire, were granted to John Darcy, and after his death, to his son.⁹⁹ Indeed, though these were rarely permanent grants,¹⁰⁰ the fact they often remained in a peer's hands for twenty years or more, usually until the restoration of alien lands in 1360, meant that they nonetheless became a semi-permanent part of his estate, at the very least for most of his lifetime.¹⁰¹

Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales (1971), 90; Matthew, Norman Monasteries, 91-92.

⁹⁷ CFR 1347-56, 105.

⁹⁸ CFR 1337-47, 230-31, 298-99; CCR 1354-60, 608.

⁹⁹ The abbey's lands in Normandy were first granted for the payment of certain debts owed by the king to Darcy, but later its' English lands seem to have turned into a patronage grant for the duration of the war. CCR 1341-43, 323; CFR 1337-47, 269. Grant renewed to his son and John de Kyngeston on 6 April 1348. CFR 1347-56, 86; D'Arcy, Life of John First Baron Darcy, 80, 100.

¹⁰⁰ Though it should be noted that the return of such lands to their original owners was by no means a necessity, and that the king often diverted them permanently into the hands of laymen, as noted by McFarlane. McFarlane, Nobility, 53-54. Raban also notes a growing tendency for the king to redirect ecclesiastical lands forfeited for other reasons from their owners in this period. S. Raban, Mortmain Legislation and the English Church (1982), 85, 133.

¹⁰¹ It is notable that most of the religious houses granted out to Edward's new creations were alien cells of the Benedictine or Black Monks, a very wealthy order. Incomes from these priories reached as high as £294 in the case of Lewisham, though most seemed to have been under £100 - not counting, of course, the profit made by the exploitation, or 'waste', of the properties by their holders. For a summary of the incomes of Benedictine alien priories in the late

Finally, forfeiture as a result of felonious acts or other legal transgressions also played its part in the patronage of the reign. As with the other types of forfeiture, Edward III may be seen as using a somewhat novel approach to the right. As Bellamy has again shown, in the period prior to 1352, when the ambit of forfeiture was set by statute,¹⁰² Edward attempted to extend the penalty of forfeiture to transgressions which had previously been considered felonies, and therefore punished by escheat only to a felon's lord.¹⁰³ Examples of this type include the forfeiture of a messuage and some parcels of property in Oxford which had been forfeited by Philip de Oo, "felon".¹⁰⁴ There were also more serious domestic crimes for which many individuals forfeited - though they were hardly worthy of disinheritance, however temporary, at least in respect to previous practice. The forfeiture in 1350 of goods and issues of the lands of John de Segrave and Margaret his wife is a case in point. The couple were outlawed as a result of nonappearance at court in a case of novel dissesin

thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, see Knowles and Hadcock, Medieval English Religious Houses, 82-86.

¹⁰² Though, as Ormrod notes, during the reign "the statute roll was . . . transformed from a series of government-inspired legal codes into a collection of short-term measures designed to placate the king's subjects". Ormrod, Edward III, 63.

¹⁰³ Though the king did get rights to the land for a year and a day. For developments concerning the ambit of forfeiture during Edward III's reign, see Bellamy, Law of Treason, 59-101.

¹⁰⁴ CPR 1334-38, 573. The forfeiture of the estate of John le Marschal of Changeton, which came back to the king as the result of le Marschal breaking the king's prison at Guildford, also fits into this category. His estate was granted to Reginald de Cobham in 1343. CPR 1337-47, 328. Cobham may still have held this as late as 1345, as he paid rent arrears at that time. E401/383 (26 October 1345).

concerning Humphrey de Bohun, Earl of Hereford and Essex - an infraction which would probably previously have only warranted a heavy fine.¹⁰⁵

But however minor the crime, these forfeitures nonetheless offered up a not insubstantial amount of open land to a king always on the look-out for new patronage sources. Philip de Oo's lands were granted to the earl of Salisbury in 1338,¹⁰⁶ and the issues of Segrave's lands to Guy de Brian and Walter de Manny in 1350.¹⁰⁷ But perhaps the most lucrative case of this sort for Edward's new peers was that connected with the abduction of Margery, widow of Nicholas de Beche, and the murder of Michael le Poynings 'le uncle'.¹⁰⁸ From these, Reginald de Cobham was granted the entire estate of Thomas Arden, one of the abductors, in fee as part of a 500 mark grant to him of lands and rents.¹⁰⁹ Michael de Poynings, another of Edward's bannerets, gained the custody of the lands of Margery de la Beche in the counties of Oxford, Berkshire, Wiltshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Surrey and Sussex, rendering 500 marks yearly for

¹⁰⁵ They were pardoned on 26 February 1351. CPR 1348-50, 541-42; CPR 1350-54, 45. For more about Segrave and his wife, see J.C. Ward, English Noblewomen in the Later Middle Ages (1992), 6, 30-31, 37.

¹⁰⁶ CPR 1334-38, 573.

¹⁰⁷ CPR 1348-50, 541-42; CPR 1350-54, 45.

¹⁰⁸ CFR 1347-56, 36, 59-60; CPR 1345-48, 268, 407. For the progress of the case in the king's court, see KB27/350/19 m. 19, 48, 55, 55d, 56. See also Bellamy, Law of Treason, 69-71; Tout, Chapters, iv, 130-31. According to Bellamy, the Beche case was probably the "immediate cause" of the clause in the Statute of Treasons (1352) that "it was not intended that those who rode armed secretly or openly so as to slay, rob, capture or kidnap should be accused as traitors", but rather merely held as felony or trespass. Bellamy, Law of Treason, 90-91.

¹⁰⁹ CPR 1348-50, 407, 460; CCR 1346-49, 451. It is notable that most of these transactions took place under the Griffon seal, noting the king's personal interest in the case.

them, which later appear to have been granted for life.¹¹⁰ Notably, a number of these came into use after Edward's political forfeitures had started to dry up,¹¹¹ though they nonetheless could be very extensive - as the grants of the estates of Margaret de la Beche and Thomas Arden illustrate. And again, though most of the properties, with the notable exception of Arden's, were only granted for limited terms, they, like the alien priories, often formed an important extension to a new man's estate.

A final source of involuntary surrender again was connected with the lands of the church, though this time it has little to do with foreign ecclesiastics. For the king also had rights concerning the vacancy of temporalities of every office from prior to the Archbishop of Canterbury.¹¹² There were only two cases of Edward using this category for patronage to his new men, but they were important ones. In July of 1350, Guy de Brian and Roger de Beauchamp along with Otto de Grandisson and Master Adam de Lichfeld were granted the guardianship of the temporalities of the bishopric of Exeter.¹¹³ This had come into the king's possession as a result of a contempt committed by John, the bishop of Exeter, and which they got control of for a fine of 200

¹¹⁰ She had, by this time, married her abductor. CFR 1347-56, 36, 59-60; CIPM ix, 239. Poynings and Cobham seem to have had quite a bit of previous contact with Nicholas de la Beche, Margery's husband, and indeed some of these lands had been placed in an enfeoffment to use in Nicholas's life time, with Poynings as one of the grantees. CP40/312/472, 495d; BP i, 133; CPR 1334-38, 421, 428; CCR 1349-54, 123.

¹¹¹ See Appendix 2.

¹¹² See E.R. Stevenson, 'The Escheator', in EGW, ii, 112. For a more detailed look at the question of royal rights over episcopal temporalities in the period, see Wright, Church and the English Crown, 155-63.

¹¹³ CPR 1348-50, 559; CFR 1347-56, 251.

marks to hold during the life of the vacancy.¹¹⁴ Similarly, on 24 April 1340, Thomas de Bradeston was granted the guardianship of the Gloucestershire temporalities of the archbishop of York, vacated by the death of William de Melton, rendering £77. 17s. 1d. per annum at the exchequer.¹¹⁵ Though such grants rarely lasted more than a year or so, the sums involved could be substantial, as the incomes recorded for the vacancies of bishoprics of Durham and Canterbury indicate.¹¹⁶

iii) Expectancies

All these different ways in which lands could escheat to the king made up the stock of manors which Edward could grant out immediately. However, they make up only part of the grants listed in Appendix 2. The final portion consists of expectancies - that is, promises on the future return of lands into the king's hand at the end of life or entailed holdings. A royal grant in expectancy meant that the king would grant that an estate remain out to a third party when the original owner's term of tenure ended, essentially creating "two estates, one in possession and one in

¹¹⁴ E401/404 (10 December 1350). The bishop was restored to the temporalities of his see on 1 December 1351. CPR 1350-54, 188-89.

¹¹⁵ CFR 1337-47, 169-72.

¹¹⁶ Ault lists the income for Durham, among others, as being £1410. 15s. 2 1/4d. for three months and Canterbury £1314. 9s. 6d. for ten months. Ault, 'Manors and Temporalities', 23. There were also forfeitures for 'misrule' which came into the hands of new men, though they were not intended to profit from these charges. For examples, see commitments connected with the abbey of St. Mary at Bruerne (Oxfordshire) and the Cistercian abbey of Bordesley (Worcestershire). CPR 1364-67, 86, 245.

expectancy, in favour of two persons at one and the same time".¹¹⁷ Technically 'remainders', sometimes imprecisely referred to as 'reversions' in the text of the grants,¹¹⁸ these expectancies could simply be "add-ons" to other patronage directed at a new creation. For instance, on 6 April 1335, in consideration of services done for both the king and his father, a grant in tail male was made to John Darcy of the manor of Rathwar and Kildalk in Ireland, by way of the forfeiture of Roger Mortimer, who had held them in turn by the forfeiture of Walter de Lacy and Almarick de Lacy, "adherents to the Scots in rebellion against him".¹¹⁹ With this, he was granted the 'reversion' of the grange of Rathwer, held for life by Herbert de Sutton - not an important gift, but one which helped round out the grant, and therefore perhaps avoid any future legal complications.¹²⁰

¹¹⁷ Potter's Historical Introduction to English Law and its Institutions (1958), 538. See also C.D. Farran, The Principles of Scots and English Land Law: A Historical Comparison (1958), 93.

¹¹⁸ When it came to royal patronage, however, the division within expectancies - that between reversion and remainders - was somewhat arbitrary. When a lord granted out a reversionary right for a piece of property, it meant that he was to be replaced in the feudal chain, and therefore had no further claim on the land after the grantee of the reversion took seisin. Thus, since the king could not be replaced as such in the feudal chain, any "reversion" he might grant out was actually a remainder, remaining away from him for a term of tenure, with ultimate reversion to him. Unsurprisingly, "reversions" and "remainders" were sometimes used interchangeably when it came to royal grants, or reversions were said to "remain" to an individual instead of "reverting" to him. For an example for the terms being used in place of each other, see the grant of lands of the countess of Pembroke to John Darcy. CCharR 1327-41, 428; CCR 1343-46, 439. For an example of reversions 'remaining' to an individual, see CPR 1334-38, 416-17, 426-27.

¹¹⁹ CPR 1334-38, 94.

¹²⁰ Which were not uncommon with forfeiture grants. See below, pp. 177-82.

But expectancies were mainly used for more important purposes, being, as they were, a useful way to keep Edward's creations contented and enthusiastic by the promise, when there were no suitable lands available,¹²¹ of the future acquisition of properties relevant to their estates. In March of 1338, Roger Beauchamp, of a southeastern family,¹²² was granted the remainder of the manor of Bloxham (Oxfordshire) for life upon the death of one John de Weston, life holder of the manor.¹²³ Similarly, on 12 July 1335, William Montagu, developing into a major power in the southwest, was granted "for good service rendered and out of special affection", along with the "king's crest of an eagle to be born by him and his heirs", the manors of Wootton

¹²¹ That expectancies were not necessarily an indication of a scarcity of land was obvious in the fact that existing land grants sometimes followed very closely on expectancies. For example, Manny's grant of the manor of Aber in North Wales was within two months of Beauchamp's grant of the following expectancy, and the reason why the former had not been granted to Beauchamp was more than likely connected with the fact that he had no interests in that area - whereas Manny certainly did, having a life grant of the castle of Harlech and the shreivalty of Merioneth in 1332. CFR 1327-1337, 340; CIPM xv, 82, 374-76; Appendix 2. Though the inquisition post mortem in the case of Beauchamp might not be proof positive of no previous interest in the area, Beauchamp perhaps having taken out enfeoffments to use, the fact that there was no mention of Wales in connection with him in any of the published PRO documents seems to make this highly unlikely. See also Appendix 8.

¹²² G.E.C. ii, 44-45.

¹²³ CFR 1337-47, 68. In April of the same year the grant was made without having to pay the usual farm for it at the exchequer, and on 20 June, he was granted the manor in fee. CPR 1338-40, 48, 96. In this instance, moreover, the grantee seems to have been very lucky, as he had only five years to wait until he gained control of the manor. Delivery of the manor was ordered on 3 November 1343, and was definitely in the possession of Beauchamp by January of 1345, when he obtained a royal licence to bring waste land into cultivation on the manor and demise some of the property involved to a third party. CCR 1343-46, 189; CPR 1343-45, 379.

FitzPaine, Frome Whitfeld, Marshwood, and Worth Matravers (Dorset) and the manor of Pool Keynes (Wiltshire), upon the failure of the direct issue of Robert and Ela FitzPaine.¹²⁴

However, expectancies seem to have been granted not only when the king was somewhat hard pressed to find appropriate lands, but also when he was especially desirous that a new creation be given some form of claim on lands at a particular time. Most important of all, expectancies predominated among the properties granted out to the six new earls in 1337. When William Montagu was created earl of Salisbury, aside from the third penny of the county of Wiltshire which customarily went to the earl, he was also granted in tail male the castle and manor of Trowbridge, and the manors of Aldbourne, Amesbury, and Winterburn (Wiltshire) and Henstrige and Charleton (Somerset), at the time held for life by John de Warrene, earl of Surrey and his wife, all in expectancy.¹²⁵ William Clinton received similar favours on becoming earl of Huntingdon.¹²⁶ In order

¹²⁴ These were lands the reversion of which had previously been forfeited by John Maltravers. CCharR 1327-41, 348-49, 359. For the major geographical interests of Edward's new creations, see Appendix 8.

¹²⁵ The Warrene lands had originally been the subject of an exchange between Warrene and Lancaster in 1318. Later, after Lancaster's death in 1322, the remainder of these lands were granted, under duress, to Edward II by Lancaster's wife, Alice, after Warrene died. F.R. Fairbank, 'The Last Earl of Warrene and Surrey, and the Distribution of his Possessions', Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, xix:2 (1907), 235-36. These expectancies, according to the terms of the grant, came to a grand total of 800 marks. Until they came in, and until 200 marks worth of land could be found to complete the grant, Montagu was to receive 1000 marks yearly out of the county of Cornwall, or, failing that, from the exchequer. CPR 1334-38, 427. For more about the fate of the Warrene lands, see below, pp. 186-87.

¹²⁶ These creations are discussed in some detail in Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 35-40.

to support this rank, which otherwise Clinton, even with his wife's income, could not, the king also granted him 1000 marks worth of land in tail male. This grant comprised the manor of Kirton (Lincolnshire) worth 500 marks a year,¹²⁷ and the rest was to be for the moment from the farms of various towns and counties which were then held by the exchequer, but eventually to be made up with other properties - the manors of Home (Huntingdonshire) and Glatton (Huntingdonshire) and the "site or place" of the castle of Huntingdon. Until that time, Clinton was to hold them in expectancy pending the deaths of Queen Isabella and the Countess of Pembroke, the life holders of the properties.¹²⁸ Those of older noble families newly elevated were not left out either. William Bohun's rise to the earldom of Northampton brought with it a host of expectancies in tail male. Chief among these were the castle, manor, and town of Stamford (Lincolnshire) and the manor and town of Grantham (Lincolnshire) all of which were again held for life by the childless John de Warrene, earl of Surrey;¹²⁹ the castle and manors of Fotheringhay (Northamptonshire) which Marie de

¹²⁷ See section i.

¹²⁸ The manors were held by Queen Isabella and the 'castle' by the countess of Pembroke. CPR 1334-38, 415. The manors, originally held by Margaret of Clare, the widow of Edmund of Almaine, earl of Cornwall, upon her death first became attached to the wardrobe in 1312, but were then moved to chamber authority in 1314. After the abolition of the chamber estate in late 1326, they were held by Thomas Wake, who had to answer for them at the exchequer, and then by Queen Isabella in 1327. They were taken up by the exchequer again after Isabella's fall in 1330, though they were then granted to her for her lifetime. Tout, Chapters, ii, 323-24, 351; iv, 230, 232, 240; Harriss, King, Parliament, and Public Finance, 157-58.

¹²⁹ The towns connected with these manors had been granted by Warrene to the king in 1318. Fairbank, 'Last Earl of Warrene and Surrey,' 209, 237.

Saint Pol, the wife of Aymer de Valence, held for life; and the castle and manor of Oakham (Rutlandshire) as well as the shrievalty of Rutland, which Hugh de Audley, earl of Gloucester, and Margaret, his wife, also held for life.¹³⁰ For the rest of the grant, made up in December of 1340, Bohun was also granted remainders of the manors of Eastwood and Rayleigh and the hundred of Rochford (Essex) which were at the time held by Queen Philippa for life.¹³¹

In total, there were one hundred and nine grants containing escheats, forfeitures and expectancies to Edward's new men during the reign. These grants accounted for, among other properties, three honours, two lordships, one stewardship, thirteen castles, and one hundred and eighteen manors.¹³² In terms of percentages, though it is

¹³⁰ Indeed, the king does not seem to have been interested in giving lands on a 'longer than life' basis to Audley, as when he made the tail male grants to him of the manors of Eckington (Derbyshire) and Kirkby in Ashfield (Nottinghamshire) in 1337 Audley was already forty-nine, and his wife was forty-seven, thereby having little chance of male heirs. Thus, the fulfilment of a grant to John Darcy in 1340 of these lands in expectancy was more or less a certainty within a generation. CPR 1338-40, 441-42, 458-59; see also Harley 805/149ob.

¹³¹ Previous to this, these lands had been obtained by Isabella during the Minority. Wolffe, Royal Demesne, 232. The remaining part of the £1000 grant was to come from the exchequer, to wit £179. 9s. 2 3/4d. until lands could be provided for the remainder. See CCharR 1327-41, 401, 484-85. Later, the grant was expanded so that whereas originally, if the estate of the earl of Essex and Hereford was inherited by Bohun or his heirs, £500 of the land would revert to the king, the latter, in light of Bohun's continued good service, granted him this £500 grant whether the inheritance fell to him or not. CCharR 1327-41, 401, 484-85.

¹³² These numbers does not include those estates granted in their entirety - for example that of the forfeiture of Thomas Arden - as it is often very difficult to tell the exact size of the estate at the time of the grant.

difficult to get exact figures, around 46% were from forfeited lands, 27% were in expectancy, 25% were from escheats (including voluntary surrenders), and 2% were the result of other circumstances.¹³³

As the most immediately evident logic in the dispersal of patronage arises from a new man's needs - which would often have found voice in various formal and informal petitions to the king as well as, presumably, the king's general knowledge of a new man's "situation" -¹³⁴ we must now try and construct a rough guide as to what issues were important to him when it came to royal patronage from these sources. Indeed, if one was going to prioritize grants by their different characteristics, at least from the viewpoint of a new creation, probably the least important issue would have been the previous history of the lands involved. For, though this could be a serious issue, especially when it came to potential future claims on the land,¹³⁵ still the main point was that these men were receiving lands from the king when others were not. Thus, there appears rarely to have been a case where an individual balked at a grant on account of the identity of the previous owner - even if it

¹³³ Calculated from the number of parcels of properties granted out - that is, lands grouped together by their geography, the nature of their tenure, and the identity of their previous owner (as they would often be grouped in the wording of the grants themselves) rather than simply the date of their grant. See Appendix Two.

¹³⁴ The process of petitioning for patronage has not been well researched in Edward III's reign, probably due to lack of extant sources, though Tuck's article on patronage in Richard II's reign may be helpful in this respect. J.A. Tuck, 'Richard II's System of Patronage', in F.R.H. Du Boulay and C.M. Barron eds., The Reign of Richard II: Essays in Honour of May McKisack (1971), esp. 4-10. See also below, p. 204 footnote 2.

¹³⁵ As will be seen in Chapter Seven.

was, for example, of the estate of Roger Mortimer, a man whose heir was gradually regaining favour as the reign progressed, and who was therefore a threat to any who might hold forfeited lands of his estate.¹³⁶

In a similar vein, the reason why the lands were under the king's control would rarely have been a problem for Edward's new peers. Though grants from escheats were often the most stable, being, as they were, usually clearly within the king's rights when they were granted out, and forfeitures more problematic, not only because of Edward's somewhat novel approach to the right but also because, as Holmes states, "the justice of inheritance was so unshakably rooted in the ideas of noble society that, unless the family died out, none of the political crises permanently crippled any estate",¹³⁷ nonetheless, a new creation could again ill afford to be selective about the source of their newly acquired properties.¹³⁸ Property of whatever background was a commodity to be sought after, and if one individual declined to take up a grant for whatever reason, it was almost certain that there would be another more than willing to take his place. Saying this, the other main type of land grants, expectancies, were obviously somewhat less desirable as a form of patronage, mainly because seisin was delayed. For, though usually well within the king's rights to grant out,¹³⁹ the fulfilment of expectancies could be postponed

¹³⁶ See below, pp. 183-85.

¹³⁷ Holmes, Estates, 40.

¹³⁸ Contemporary reaction to all these types of grant, including forfeitures, will be dealt with in Chapter Seven.

¹³⁹ Though not always, as when Reginald de Cobham was forced to give up the 'reversion' of Strood, an old Templar manor,

well beyond the life of the intended recipient. Indeed, many grants of future interest in a piece of property were kept away from the grantees well past their deaths, and even the deaths of their sons and grandsons. This was particularly a problem when women held estates as they were often quite long-lived in this period.¹⁴⁰ Indeed, most of the major expectancies of the reign were dependent on the death of a woman, whether because she held the estate in her own right or by right of her husband. One such case was a grant in expectancy to John Darcy of three manors of the Countess of Pembroke's estate.¹⁴¹ Widow of Aymer de Valence, earl of Pembroke, Marie de St. Pol was the holder of the life interest in a vast estate of her husband. On 1 September 1337, Darcy, raised to the peerage a few years earlier,¹⁴² was granted in tail male the remainder of the manors of Newsam Temple and Hurst Temple (Yorkshire) and of Torksey (Lincolnshire) which the countess held for life.¹⁴³ However, Darcy had the misfortune to predecease Marie by about thirty

to the countess of Pembroke, who had already been granted the manor in fee. CPR 1340-43, 461.

¹⁴⁰ For the overall question of dowagers in later medieval England, see R.E. Archer, 'Rich Old Ladies: The Problem of Late Medieval Dowagers', in A. Pollard, ed., Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History (1984), 15-35.

¹⁴¹ See H. Jenkinson, 'Mary de Sancto Paulo, Foundress of Pembroke College, Cambridge', Archaeologia (66: 1914-15), 401-46. For the history of this woman during Edward II's reign and her problems after the death of her husband, see J.R.S. Phillips, Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke: 1307-1324 (1972), 235-39.

¹⁴² Darcy was also a retainer of the Earl of Pembroke in the previous reign. Phillips, Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke, 260.

¹⁴³ CCharR 1327-41, 428; Lansdowne 207A f. 93-95 (penciled in "59-60"). In 18 Edward III, granted free warren in all his demesne lands of Newsam Temple in Yorkshire. CCharR 1341-1417, 36; Harley 805 230/149.

years, so that when the land did finally come in the late 1370's, it came to his grandson, Philip, rather than to himself.¹⁴⁴

But perhaps the most sensational of these cases was that of Queen Isabella. Though forced to give up her lands as a result of the 1330 coup, Edward III nonetheless gave his mother a substantial life estate worth in the neighbourhood of £3000 per annum.¹⁴⁵ However, after the death of Isabella, these lands were to revert, or be inherited by, the king due to his position as son and chief lord of the lands involved. As a result, they were used as a major source of expectancy grants during the reign of Edward III, making up a significant portion of the 1337 grants. William Clinton was to receive part of her estate, the manors of Home and Glatton in Huntingdonshire, in tail male.¹⁴⁶ However, Clinton was to die in 1354, five years before Queen Isabella, and furthermore died without male heirs. William Montagu, created earl of Salisbury, was likewise granted manors in Cheshire, Norfolk, Suffolk and Lincolnshire.¹⁴⁷ However, though Montagu was to die in 1344, this time fifteen years before the queen, he nonetheless had made arrangements with Isabella to gain seisin of the land soon after the original

¹⁴⁴ CFR 1369-77, 402.

¹⁴⁵ See above, p. 42.

¹⁴⁶ CPR 1334-38, 409, 410, 415.

¹⁴⁷ The castle and manor of Hawarden, the stewardship of Chester, the manors of Lea, Bosley and Neston (Cheshire); the manor of Kenninghall (Norfolk); the manors of Framsdan and Kessingland and a carucate of land and £20 rent in the towns of Framsdan and Kessingland (Suffolk); and the manor of Mablethorpe, lands in Hermeston and the castle and town of Mold (Lincolnshire). CCharR 1327-41, 431-32. For Isabella's attornment for these properties to Montagu as her reversionary lord, see also Harleian Charter 43 D26.

grant was made -¹⁴⁸ showing that, if one had enough money and connections, the inconvenience of expectancies could be avoided.

Nonetheless, though the new creations may well have had their preferences, any royal patronage was generally viewed as a good thing, and usually had to be accepted in the form it came. The timing of grants, however, seems to have been a more pivotal issue to new man and king alike as, if the individual involved was less well off, they usually had to come by the time he was called upon to perform certain duties, whether in the parliamentary chamber or on the battlefield.¹⁴⁹ After all, a new man had to be able to sustain himself and his family before he reached either place - in the former case so that he would be taken seriously by the old nobility and in the latter so that his family would be provided for while he was off fighting. It is unsurprising, then, that there was a concentration of land grants in the first two decades of Edward's independent rule, often coming before the outbreak of war or before a summons to parliament, and often to the most pressing of cases - that is, those who had yet the wealth to sustain themselves properly. Grants to John Beauchamp, Thomas Bradeston and Reginald de Cobham, as well as the less well

¹⁴⁸ As a result of an agreement made between Isabella and Montagu, these came under the control of the latter in 1338 when, in exchange for 600 marks per year from a 1000 mark annuity which Montagu held off the coinage of tin in the county of Cornwall, Isabella surrendered to him the lands involved - though notably with the proviso that she have "power of re-entry by her into the castle and manor of Hawardyn and the other lands in default of payment of such annuity". CPR 1338-40, 114-15; Cotton Charter xi, 61.

¹⁴⁹ See also above, pp. 23.

off of the 1337 earls, such as Bohun, stand as examples of this. Even Montagu's agreement with Isabella over the expectancies on her lands may be seen as an attempt by a new man to solidify his estate before he went off to war. To a new creation, then, the timely arrival of a grant before he was called to exert himself on the king's behalf was often a necessary precursor to being able to perform with adequate vigour.

However, these were nonetheless relatively minor issues in the eyes of a new creation in comparison with the final two which would have made up the prime focus of his interests - namely, where the royal grants were situated and how the lands involved were granted to him. Concerning the former, it was of primary importance to a new man that such grants reflected the geography of his estate prior to that point. Indeed, unless the king, for reasons of his own, was out to create a new sphere of influence for an individual, grants did tend to match previous holdings. Using Robert Ufford again as an example, his family's interests, as well as the dower portion of his wife's estate from a previous marriage, lay primarily in East Anglia.¹⁵⁰ In response to this, Ufford received a number of land grants in the area throughout his career, some as a result of his part in the 1330 coup, others in connection to his elevation to the earldom of Suffolk in 1337, still others simply as a show of more routine favour by the king - such as an extension to a grant in fee of his life hold of the castle and town of

¹⁵⁰ G.E.C. xii:2, 148-53, DNB lviii, 9-10. For his wife's dower portion, see CCR 1323-27, 117-18. Concerning Ufford's career, see also above, pp. 17-20.

Ufford and grants of escheated and forfeited lands and rents in Essex, Suffolk and London.¹⁵¹ And, though grants did not always conform to previous areas of interest, especially when a new man had very limited previous holdings, as in the case of Walter Manny, or when the king wished to ensure he had a more ubiquitous presence in all corners of the kingdom, such as seems to have been the case with William Montagu, similar stories can nonetheless usually be told for most other peerage creations.¹⁵²

But arguably the most important aspect of royal patronage of all, at least to a posterity minded "up and comer" of the later Middle Ages, were the terms under which a grant was made. Of the five main types of grant which could be made to a new creation - namely limited term,¹⁵³ life, tail male, entail, and fee - it was obvious that, where possible, he would want his lands granted in the most secure form of tenure - namely, in fee. After all, a man of this period was not only looking to his own well being, but that of his heirs, and these could not, obviously, be served by limited term and life grants. But perhaps less obviously, nor could they always be served by entail, and especially tail male, grants. For though at first glance meant simply to keep lands in the direct or male line for the sake of the grantee, in practice both these types of grant often tended to work in the interests of the grantor. Not only did they

¹⁵¹ For a complete list of royal grants to Ufford, see Appendix 2.

¹⁵² For Manny and Montagu, see Appendix 8. To chart how a new man's previous interests were reflected in the royal grants of escheats, forfeitures and expectancies to him, compare Appendix 2 with the first column of Appendix 8.

¹⁵³ That is, less than life.

prevent lands so demised from being alienated by sale, entails also ensured that if the grantee failed to produce an appropriate heir, or in the case of tail male, the often elusive male heir, the lands would be returned to the grantor - in this case, the king.¹⁵⁴ And it is hard to believe that a new creation would prefer his family not to have the lands at all than to have them fall into the hands of a daughter or cousin. Thus, if one examines the "term" column on Appendix 2, one will note that when the terms of grants are changed - more than likely as a result of petition - they were often towards grants in fee.¹⁵⁵ As with the case of Ufford's grant of a house in London, from being granted in limited term to in tail male to "in fee", as in the case of an "enlargement" of Cobham's life grant of the manor of Chippenham to be in fee, in both theory and practice, it was obvious that the new creation

¹⁵⁴ There was a clause in some grants in the fourteenth century that, in the case of male line failure, the grant would revert or remain to the grantee's "right heirs" of whatever gender - though this phrase was only twice included in Edward's grants, and the practice itself seems to have become less popular as the century progressed. See McFarlane, Nobility, 271-72; Appendix 2; see also below, p. 207 footnote 7. Most of Edward's grants either simply noted inheritance by male heirs with an implicit reversion to the king upon the failure of the direct male line, as in the 1337 land grants to William Bohun which specified that the lands "should remain to him in tail male", or had a phrase similar to the Darcy grant of Pembroke lands, where the lands were granted "to be held by the said John and the heirs male of his body with all appurtenances, with reversion to the king and his heirs". For the former, see CPR 1334-38, 416-17; for the latter, see CCharR 1327-41, 428.

¹⁵⁵ The grants changed back to "less than fee" were surely because it was obvious that the individual involved was not going to procreate, as in the case of both John Beauchamp and John Stryvelyn. See Appendices One and Two.

understandably preferred royal land grants to be on such terms.

Unfortunately, as we shall see in Chapter Eight, the interests of a new man did not coincide with the king's on this rather important last point. Nonetheless, all these issues would more than likely have been in both noble and royal minds at the time when the grants were made, and would have influenced the identity of any properties given out. And, aside the question of the terms of grants, the king seems to have tried to accommodate his new men in respect of their more important preferences - as can be seen both by a comparison of Appendices 1 and 2, where it will be observed that most of the more important, and less well off, of the new elevations were at least partially endowed either before they went off to war or rose to the peerage; and, as in Appendix 8, where one can generally see a conscious attempt to make land grants where the new man had previous interests.¹⁵⁶ In this way, then, Edward satisfied the desire of his new peerage for land, at the very least for the term of their lives, in order to have a firmly royalist section within the nobility of the realm.

¹⁵⁶ Unless, of course, the new man had only very limited territorial interests previously.

CHAPTER THREE Marriage Rights and Arrangements

Grants of escheats, forfeitures and expectancies made up the bulk of Edward's direct endowments based on his rights as overlord. However, there was one other feudal right which had the potential for long term endowment - that of the control over the marriage of the heirs and heiresses of his tenants-in-chief.¹ From the time of the Conquest, the control of the marriage of an underaged or widowed heir of an estate held in chief had been the king's.² Indeed, due to the custom of "prerogative wardship", this held true even if only a small part of the deceased's lands was held in chief.³ Moreover, over the course of the thirteenth century, certain legal developments helped to augment the power of this royal right further still.⁴ Both the growth in the king's ability

¹ In the case of an underaged heir, this right was usually connected with the guardianship of the body. S.S. Walker, 'Free Consent and Marriage of Feudal Wards in Medieval England', JMH 8 (1982), 123. The main works dealing with the royal feudal right of marriage in the Middle Ages are: Waugh, Lordship of England, esp. 207-21; Ward, English Noblewomen, 12-33. Concerning the later mediaeval nobility in particular, see J.T. Rosenthal, 'Aristocratic Marriage and the English Peerage, 1350-1500: Social Institution and Personal Bond', JMH 10 (1984), 181-94. After Magna Carta, according to Waugh, the king's control over the marriage of widows was somewhat lessened, moving from the right to choose marriage partners to simply the right of veto over the marriage - though this still effectively meant that the king's goodwill was a necessity for any proposed marriage. Waugh, Lordship of England, 86.

² Unless, of course, the heir or heiress had already been betrothed. Waugh, Lordship of England, 146.

³ J.M.W. Bean, From Lord to Patron: Lordship in Late Medieval England (1989), 140. For a recent study of the background to this right, see S.F.C. Milsom, 'The Origin of Prerogative Wardship', in G. Garnet and J. Hudson, eds., Law and Government in Mediaeval England and Normandy: Essays in Honour of Sir James Holt (1994), 223-44.

⁴ Although there was also a concurrent growth in protection for the ward. See Waugh, Lordship of England, 80-81. For an example of a protection against disparagement in a grant, see CPR 1350-54, 124.

to regulate the division of estates amongst coheiresses,⁵ and the fact that the Statute of *Quia Emptores* (1290) started a permanent increase in the number of lands held in chief,⁶ meant that, at the start of his reign, Edward III had one of the firmest grips on the right yet known by an English king. Add to this the control over maritagiums and marriage portions inherent in such rights and Edward's hold over the marriage rights of royal wards was of key importance for his endowment programme.⁷

Marriage had always been a rapid route to social advancement, though, as Waugh notes, "royal lordship served as a powerful lever in opening it to individuals".⁸ This power could be used by the king for the sake of his new

⁵ Though the rise of enfeoffment to use was to lessen the wealth these women brought with them into marriages. For a discussion of the increasing role of the king in the partition of estates amongst co-heiresses, see S.L. Waugh, 'Women's Inheritance and the Growth of Bureaucratic Monarchy in Twelfth and Thirteenth-Century England', Nottingham Medieval Studies xxxiv (1990), esp. 83-92.

⁶ Simpson, History of the Land Law, 23. See also above, p. 31.

⁷ For a commonly used example of this from within Edward's new creations, see Reginald de Cobham's marriage to Joan, daughter of Lord Berkeley and Margaret, daughter of Roger de Mortimer, earl of March. This marriage carried with it a marriage portion of £2900 and the manor of Langley Burrell (Wiltshire). See G.E.C, iii, 355. On the maritagium and the marriage portion, see McFarlane, Nobility, 64, 84-85. Given-Wilson, however, believes that McFarlane might have been overstating the case concerning the decline of the maritagium and the rise of the marriage portion in the fourteenth century. See Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 203.

⁸ Waugh gives William de Valence, Roger d'Amory and Piers Gaveston as examples from previous reigns. Waugh, Lordship of England, 207. For the importance of the right marriages previous to the reign of Edward III, see R.C. DeAragon, 'In Pursuit of Aristocratic Women: A Key to Success in Norman England', Albion 17 (1982), 258-66; Lally, 'Secular Patronage in the Court of King Henry II', 165-67. M. Prestwich, 'Royal Patronage under Edward I', in P.R. Coss and S.D. Lloyd, eds. Thirteenth Century England I: Proceedings of the Newcastle upon Tyne Conference, 1985 (1986), 41-44.

creations in two ways. The first was to grant the right of guardianship over the marriage, as well as often the receipt of the marriage fine,⁹ of the ward of a tenant-in-chief to a new creation. In the period 1330-77, thirty-four rights of marriage were granted out by Edward III to nineteen of his new creations: thirteen in the period 1331-40, twelve in 1341-50, five in 1351-60, and four from that point until the end of the reign. Thirty-one concerned underage heirs and heiresses while only three were to do with widows - most of the latter were used for the peers' own marriages.¹⁰ Of those whose sex are mentioned in the grant, ten were male and four female. Though eleven of these have evidence of some type of price, only three are over 300 marks, and rarely was an amount close to the actual worth of the grant.¹¹

Due to the large and varied number of marriages thereby placed at the king's disposal - basically all those of the

⁹ For example, on 4 November 1339 Thomas Bradeston was granted the marriage of Margery, widow of John de Briaunzon, "to wit any fine she make for her marriage or the forfeiture due if she marry without licence of the king or the said Thomas". CPR 1338-40, 400.

¹⁰ See below, p. 78 ff.

¹¹ Often, moreover, the marriage fine was waived. For example, when Guy de Brian was granted the marriage of the heir of Ralph le Botiller of Northbury, he was pardoned the amount within six months. CFR 1337-47, 277-78; CCR 1341-43, 469; CPR 1340-43, 518. Notably, however, payment of fines became more common as the reign progressed. After 1348 all ten of the grants of marriage had a fine attached to them, six of which are recorded as being paid on the receipt rolls. For examples, see Saint Quintin - E401/396 (24 October 1348); Botreaux - E401/419 (22 April 1353 and 8 May 1353); Bonet - E401/419 (16 April 1353); Criketot - E401/442 (6 June 1357) and E401/449 (8 February 1359); Tybetot E401/524 (20 June 1377); Bradeston E401/518 (9 April 1375). This was likely part of more general attempts to maximize feudal profits in the years following the Black Death. See W.M. Ormrod, 'Edward III's Government of England, c. 1346-1356', unpublished D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford (1984), 243-49.

families of his tenants-in-chief -¹² this right, of all his feudal rights, allowed Edward III the best opportunity to make his grants more clearly reflect the interests of his new creations. As a result, some of these grants arose from the desire for a creation to control the royal feudal rights connected with his own kinsmen, something very important if he did not wish the members of his extended family to become part of inopportune matches. Edward III's grant of the marriage of Isabella, widow of Norman Darcy, to John Darcy in 1340, and, later that same year, of the marriage of Philip, his son and heir, is an example of this.¹³ Though only a small estate was connected with these rights - it comprised solely the manor of Nocton (Lincolnshire) which Norman had held with his wife in tail -¹⁴ it appears to have been a long standing part of the Darcy inheritance, thus more than likely having considerable symbolic value. Indeed, by making these grants, according to R.F. D'Arcy, the king was acknowledging "that Darcy had become in fact, the head of the family".¹⁵

The identity of a right of marriage granted to a new creation could also be dictated primarily by its usefulness as a grant to a third party - either for profit or to show favour.¹⁶ For example, on 26 May 1347 Roger Beauchamp was

¹² It is notable that the king had the right to the body and marriage of all wards of his tenants-in-chief, even when enfeoffment to use and/or jointure was employed to keep the connected estates out of royal control. See Ward, English Noblewomen, 17.

¹³ CPR 1340-43, 42, 46; CPR 1337-47, 194.

¹⁴ CIPM viii, 221.

¹⁵ D'Arcy, Life of John First Baron Darcy, 99. The Darcys appear to have been a relatively close knit family who watched out for one another. See CPR 1321-24, 103.

¹⁶ Waugh, Lordship of England, 194.

granted the marriages of the two daughters and heirs of Herbert de Saint Quintin.¹⁷ He duly paid for these marriages in October of 1348.¹⁸ Three years later, in July of 1351, Beauchamp granted these marriages, probably in exchange for either money or other forms of remuneration, to another of Edward's new men, John de Grey of Rotherfield.¹⁹ In other instances, a marriage might be granted by a new creation to a member of the ward's family, perhaps as a form of reward. Walter de Manny's landed interests had little or no connection with those of one Edmund de Benstead, of whose heir he was granted the wardship and marriage in 1337.²⁰ Thus, the grant he made of the marriage to the widow of Edmund, Petronilla, can only be understood in terms of the desire of Manny to show favour to the Benstead family.²¹

¹⁷ CFR 1347-56, 35; CPR 1348-50, 85; CCR 1346-49, 482. They were the heiresses of a considerable estate, including the manors of Stanton St. Quintin (Wiltshire), Belchalwell (Dorset), Great Bradley (Berkshire), Brandsburton (Yorkshire), Wodehall (Yorkshire) and Mappleton (Yorkshire). CIPM ix, 25-28.

¹⁸ For the sum of 100 marks. Apparently the amount rendered for the wardship and marriage was partly the result of negotiations between Beauchamp and the treasurer. CPR 1348-50, 85, 193; CCR 1346-49, 482; E401/396 (24 October 1351).

¹⁹ CPR 1350-54, 124. That it is highly unlikely that this was anything but a financial arrangement is indicated by the fact that not only did Grey have substantial holdings in the north, whereas Beauchamp did not, but that neither man is recorded as having any prior or subsequent contact with the other. Indeed, considering that most of Herbert de Saint Quintin's estate lay in Yorkshire, it probably was far more logical that Grey should have held it than Beauchamp. For the Saint Quintin estate, see CIPM ix, 25-28. For Beauchamp's interests, see CIPM xv, 82, 374-76; G.E.C. ii, 44-45; Given-Wilson, 'The Court and Household of Edward III', 175-78. For Grey's interests, see CIPM x, 405-08, G.E.C. vi, 145-47.

²⁰ CPR 1334-38, 557; CPR 1338-40, 11; CCR 1339-41, 296. The dower portion of the estate came in on 14 May 1342. CCR 1341-43, 432.

²¹ CPR 1338-40, 243. In the entry on the Patent Rolls recording the king's acceptance of the transaction, it was noted that Manny was to retain hold of the custody of the

Similarly, the control of a marriage of a retainer could also be the point of a grant, as when, in May of 1336 John Grey was granted the control of the wardship and marriage of William, son and heir of Robert de Moreby, whose family seems to have been in a position subservient to the Grey's from early on in the century.²²

But, somewhat surprisingly, grants of marriage rights reflecting these interests seem to be in the minority in Edward's matrimonial patronage to his new creations. Of far greater importance in dictating the distribution of such grants seems to have been the more general geographical concerns of a new man.²³ For instance, on 17 September 1340, Thomas Bradeston, a rising member of the Gloucestershire gentry and one of Edward's new men, was granted the marriage of John, son and heir of William de la More, a minor Gloucestershire landholder.²⁴ Five weeks later he was further granted the marriage of the mother of William de la More, Matilda, wife of Thomas de la More.²⁵ As a further extension to the grant, on 8 January 1341, Bradeston was given the wardships of the lands of the deceased William de la More, comprising mainly the manor of Oldland (Gloucestershire) as well as receiving the marriage of the heir without having to

lands. However, Bean has them as having been enfeoffed to use to others before his death. Bean, The Decline of English Feudalism, 210, 310.

²² CPR 1334-38, 270. In 1311, Margaret, widow of John de Grey, sought her dower in chancery through William de Moreby and Richard de la Coppe. CCR 1307-13, 449.

²³ See Appendix 3a.

²⁴ CPR 1340-43, 40; CIPM viii, 184; Smyth, The Lives of the Berkeleys, 284.

²⁵ CPR 1340-43, 61.

pay anything for it.²⁶ On May 4, the king allowed the dower portion of the More inheritance to go to Matilda and her new husband, Simon Basset, with Thomas getting the fine for forfeiture from the couple for having married without the king's licence.²⁷ Finally, Bradeston was confirmed in his wardship of the other two thirds of the inheritance on May 7, paying £7. 15s. a year for it.²⁸ In the space of eight months, then, Bradeston had gained control over most of the royal feudal incidents connected with the More family, all in the name of patronage and only paying out what it was worth in rent at the exchequer. Moreover, by allowing the marriage of the More widow to Simon Basset, another prominent member of the Gloucestershire gentry, Bradeston was able to further reinforce his position in the area.²⁹ And, though the heir died while still under age, his sister and next heir was also by right controlled by Bradeston,³⁰ and again was married by him into a prominent Gloucestershire family, this time that of Berkeley.³¹ Such, then, was obviously a good way to exert power over one's

²⁶ CFR 1337-47, 200; for an extent of Oldland, see Abstracts of Inquisitions Post Mortem for Gloucestershire (BRS 40 1968), 279-80.

²⁷ CCR 1341-43, 69-70.

²⁸ CFR 1337-47, 211. See also CCR 1341-43, 69.

²⁹ Saul, Knights and Esquires, 74-75.

³⁰ CIPM ix, 285.

³¹ CFR 1347-56, 215. Cecily was not noted as being married on the death of her brother, when she had just turned fourteen. CIPM ix, 285. The heirs of Stephen de la More are also recorded as being under the control of Bradeston and Edmund le Blount in 1346. S. Maclean, 'Knights' Fees in Gloucestershire', Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society xi (1886-87), 325.

neighbours as well as helping to cement alliances with more prestigious families.³²

Indeed, from Appendix 3a, one gets the impression that geographical concerns were the prime worth of marriage rights to Edward's new creations - of the thirty-four grants, twenty-four mainly reflect the geographical interests of a new man rather than existing social connections or the desire to make a quick profit. Considering that many of the men who received this form of patronage were the less well off and therefore more needy of Edward's new creations, this was quite logical. After all, if one was of a lesser county family such as Bradeston,³³ there would often be little to be gained from the control of marriage rights of one's own kinsmen, save to prevent them from going to others. Moreover, even the sale of a marriage was often only of limited use, being essentially worth a one-off payment, though often substantial, to a new man. Rather, it was of far more interest for a new creation to

³² Bradeston gained a similar hold over the Giffard family, though partly also as a result of the favour of Mortimer and Isabella who gave him a six year custodianship of the manor of Winterburn (Gloucestershire). CPR 1327-30, 146; CPR 1330-34, 228. This manor later seems to have come permanently into Bradeston's estate. See CFR 1369-77, 32; Saul, Knights and Esquires, 76.

³³ According to Saul, the origins of the Bradeston family were "obscure". Bradeston himself had been made a 'scutifer' of the king's household in 1328, and a knight in 1334. N. Saul, Knights and Esquires: The Gloucestershire Gentry in the Fourteenth Century (1981), 76-77. Harvey places Bradeston in the Berkeley affinity. B.R. Harvey, 'The Berkeleys of Berkeley 1281-1417: A Study in the Lesser Peerage of Late Mediaeval England', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Saint Andrews (1988), 192-94, 378. See also R. Austin, 'Notes on the Family of Bradeston', Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society xlvii (1925), 280-81. A summary of royal patronage given to Bradeston by Edward III may be found in J. Smyth, The Lives of the Berkeleys (1883), i, 282-86.

gain and retain the marriage rights of the more well-to-do neighbouring families whereby he could enhance his power in a locality, but over which otherwise he would have no control. Indeed, this holds true even as one goes up the social scale. Perhaps the prime example of the use to which a more well off new man could put a marriage so granted was the way John Darcy used the Ormond marriage. Originally a member of the northern gentry, Darcy's interest in Ireland appears to have begun in 1323 when he was made justiciar there by Edward II, holding the office almost continuously between that date and 1340 - when he was called back to England by the king.³⁴ This, along with the fact that in 1329 he married Joan, widow of Thomas, Earl of Kildare,³⁵ as well as further grants by the king to Darcy,³⁶ meant that he had developed considerable interests in the country by the 1340's. It was appropriate, then, that in March of 1346, Darcy, "for good and long service" gained control of the marriage of James Butler, the underage son of the Earl of Ormond, and stepson of another peer, Thomas Dagworth (Dagworth had married the countess Ormond in 1344) in exchange for 1000 marks at the exchequer - which, though a large sum for the time, was nothing in comparison to the

³⁴ For a brief discussion of Darcy's career, see G.E.C. iv, 54. For a more indepth discussion, see D'Arcy, John First Baron Darcy of Knayth, passim. For Darcy's career in Ireland, see J.A. Watt, 'The Anglo-Irish Colony Under Strain, 1327-99', in Cosgrove, ed., New History of Ireland, ii, 365-66.

³⁵ G.E.C. iv, 54; D'Arcy, John First Baron Darcy of Knayth, 49.

³⁶ For example CFR 1327-37, 300-01; CPR 1334-38, 94; CPR 1338-40, 458-59.

annual revenues of the estate.³⁷ Indeed, the young earl of Ormond was to hold upon his majority a sizable estate in Tipperary and Kildare as well as a number of manors spread over southern England.³⁸ Unsurprisingly, the marriage was not sold again, but rather used for Darcy's own family - that is, the marriage of his daughter to the young earl at some point soon after 1346, making her son the second earl of Ormond.³⁹ The usefulness of such a connection to the earldom of Ormond lay, then, in expanding the influence of the Irish estate which Darcy had developed over the course of his career. This, along with the acquisition, again for 1000 marks, by William Montagu of the Mortimer heir in June 1336, later to be married to his daughter Philippa, mark two of

³⁷ CFR 1337-47, 465; E401/388 (18 May 1347). Concerning the Dagworth marriage, see below, pp. 85-86. The Ormond marriage had earlier been granted to another Irish noble and companion of Darcy, the earl of Desmond, in April of 1344, but was later withdrawn, probably due to Desmond's restiveness at the King's resumption of grants and the dismissal of all Irishmen from royal office. Whatever the case, Darcy seems to have profited from his friend's disgrace and his own loyalty, and had only to pay 1000 marks instead of the original 2300 marks. G.E.C iv, 238-39; CPR 1343-45, 244; CCR 1343-46, 328. On April 2 of the same year, Darcy was also given the wardship of all the lands in Ireland of the earl, rendering only the extent for it yearly. CFR 1337-47, 465-66. That Darcy was being offered a bargain price is indicated in the fact that Butler's father, also called James, had had, in 1325, to agree to a 2000 mark fine simply for his marriage. See CPR 1324-27, 203; CFR 1327-37, 367, 368, 381; see also Darcy, Life of John, First Baron Darcy, 40.

³⁸ The manors of Thurles in Ely, Ardemaill, Le Britag with Karkeul, Moyalui, Carrikmagrffyn, Nanagh, Clonleynan (Tipperary), Long Compton (Warwickshire), Finborough (Suffolk), Smeetham (Essex), Sopley (Hampshire), Aston Blank (Gloucestershire), Shere and 'la Vacherie' (Surrey), Rotherfield Peppard (Oxfordshire), Kilpeck (Herefordshire), three parts of the manor of Aylesbury and the manors of Twyford and Great Linford (Buckinghamshire), and the manor of Weeton (Lancashire). CIPM viii, 117-27.

³⁹ They were granted a papal dispensation - the marriage being within the fourth degree, in May of 1346. G.E.C. x, 121.

the most significant grants of marriage rights during the reign.⁴⁰

But by far the most important consequences of the king's feudal right of the marriage of his tenants-in-chief came when the peer was given the marriage for himself. Granted, perhaps some young men on the rise did marry for genuine affection,⁴¹ but such marriages were in the minority. Rather continuation of the line and social advancement seem to have been the main subject in mind when marriages were arranged.⁴² Of the sixty-seven peers we are dealing with, twenty-five took part in twenty-six marriages before 1330, thirty-one took part in thirty-three marriages during the period 1330-77, and seventeen marriages are undatable.⁴³ Only one, John Beauchamp of Warwick, did not marry at all, a rarity in the

⁴⁰ Notably with the apparently preferential proviso that "if the said heir die before the time when he could of right be married, or there can be any other impediment whereby William or his executors cannot effect the marriage, or she to whom the heir be married by him or his executors cannot have her dower of the heir's lands, grant that 500 marks of the said fine be subtracted". CFR 1327-37, 488-489, G.E.C. viii, 445. There is no mention of this fine being paid in the receipt rolls, yet there is also no evidence of a pardon for the amount. E401/332 ff; Close Rolls, passim.

⁴¹ See Rosenthal, 'Aristocratic Marriage and the English Peerage', 187-92. Notably sixteen out of the seventy-six marriages of new creations were to women to whom either a surname or a Christian name cannot be given, thus perhaps indicating the obscurity of their origins, or at least their relative lack of importance as marriage partners. See Appendix 3b and The Complete Peerage, passim.

⁴² Indeed, though the emphasis here is on the second of these issues, it must never be forgotten how important descendants were to a mediaeval noble. One has only to look at the persistence with which the earl of Surrey had tried to put away his apparently barren wife in favour of another - by whom he had had male offspring - to realize this. See Fairbank, 'Last Earl of Warrene', 197ff.

⁴³ See Appendix 3b.

Middle Ages but especially within a class so interested in personal advancement through connections.⁴⁴

Indeed, a good marriage was a necessity for any male with aspirations to a higher status in the Middle Ages, and many were willing to risk the king's displeasure to obtain such an arrangement - including one or two of Edward's new men. In one instance, Walter de Manny and Margaret, widow of Lord Segrave, daughter and coheir of Thomas of Brotherton, earl of Norfolk, were guilty of simply marrying, or in their case, intermarrying without royal licence at some point in the mid 1350's -⁴⁵ though one must wonder if the king was also somewhat perturbed at a wealthy titled heiress marrying beneath her station without royal consent.⁴⁶ Such attempts to circumvent the usual routes of marriage could, however, be more controversial, depending upon the difference in rank between the prospective bride and her suitor. The countess

⁴⁴ This might have had something to do with Beauchamp being a younger son of Guy Beauchamp, earl of Warwick. For the treatment of younger sons in the later Middle Ages, see R.L. Friedrichs, 'Marriage Strategies and Younger Sons in Fifteenth-Century England', Mediaeval Prosopography 14:1 (Spring, 1993), 53-69.

⁴⁵ Putting Manny in his mid-forties, somewhat late for a first marriage - though this may well have been connected with his very active military career. See G.E.C. viii, 571-76.

⁴⁶ For a discussion of this marriage, as well as the more general financial position of Manny's wife, see R.E. Archer, 'The Estates and Finances of Margaret of Brotherton, c.1320-1399', BIHR lx (1987), 264-80. Their pardon for this was part of a larger pardon enrolled in the Patent Rolls in which the couple is forgiven "all rancours and wraths conceived against them by the king for any causes", which included going abroad against the king's will. It would seem that the latter infringement alone would be insufficient cause to dispossess the couple of all Margaret's lands, even if she had also been neglecting to make the appropriate payments at the exchequer. See CPR 1354-58, 325. The fact that, during his period of disgrace, Manny's office of the serjeant of the marshalsea was granted to the royal cook may also be indicative of Edward's state of mind. CPR 1354-58, 147.

of Lincoln, twice widowed, once by Thomas earl of Lancaster and once by Ebulo Lestraunge, and therefore twice dowered, as well as being the Lacy heiress in her own right, was a very worthwhile prospect for anyone on the rise.⁴⁷ As a result, Hugh de Frene, a Herefordshire knight, decided to abduct her from Bolingbroke castle in the winter of 1335,⁴⁸ and at some point thereafter married her.⁴⁹ The couple were subsequently imprisoned by royal command and orders were sent out to confiscate all their lands.⁵⁰ Nonetheless, obviously accepting the marriage as a fait accompli, by the spring the king had pardoned them and restored their lands.⁵¹ Though Frene did not have much time to enjoy the estate,⁵² nor the rise to the peerage at least partly resulting from it,⁵³ this is none the less evidence of the importance of a good marriage to a fourteenth century man on the make.⁵⁴

⁴⁷ For an overview of the countess's matrimonial career, see G.E.C. vii, 687.

⁴⁸ CPR 1334-38, 282.

⁴⁹ Before 23 March 1336. G.E.C. vii, 687.

⁵⁰ CFR 1327-37, 473; CCR 1333-37, 561.

⁵¹ CCR 1333-37, 353, 564, 554; CFR 1327-37, 491.

⁵² Frene died in Scotland at some point in late 1336 or early 1337. G.E.C. vii, 687.

⁵³ Though whether because of the size of the estate or its identity is open to question. See above, p. 11 footnote 42; see also Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 324. That, at least in the case of higher noble titles, Frene was never summoned as earl of Lincoln seems to weaken the case for the link between identity of estate and parliamentary summons.

⁵⁴ Though there was no attempt to protect the lands earmarked for descent to either the earl of Lancaster or his son, it is nonetheless notable that the couple did attempt to make sure that certain lands connected with her second marriage - including the castle and manor of Clifford - were regranted in jointure, with remainders to one Roger Lestraunge of Knokyn and his heirs - obviously an heir general of her second husband, Sir Elbes Lestraunge. Though life seisin should have gone to Frene anyway on the event of her death due to the "courtesy of England" rule, the irregular circumstances surrounding their marriage might have led the couple to fear lest the right be ignored in such an instance

Most such marriages, however irregular their original arrangements, were sooner or later accepted and sometimes even condoned by the king.⁵⁵ Luckily, the majority of Edward's new men did not need to resort to such extremes in order to find suitable brides. Many, as we have seen, had already enhanced their estates by profitable marriages before Edward's accession to power. In some instances, indeed, the estates of the women these men married may arguably have been one of the reasons for individual summons to parliament.⁵⁶ But in other cases, marriages in previous regimes simply marked the beginnings of the ascent of a man. Five of the six 1337 earls had made worthwhile marriages by the time Edward gained independent control of the kingdom in 1330, thereby making them significantly less expensive to endow than they otherwise would have been.⁵⁷ A prime example is the case of William Clinton, the younger son of a Warwickshire gentry family,⁵⁸ and apparently something of a

- hence part of the rationale behind the jointure clause. See CPR 1334-38, 319.

⁵⁵ For example, see Ralph Stafford's abduction of the daughter and only heir of Hugh de Audley. C. Rawcliffe, The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham 1394-1521 (1978), 8-10. McFarlane, Nobility, 201-03; Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 357; Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 40-42. Thomas Holland's marriage to the countess of Kent can also be put in this category. For the lengthy story over the legitimacy of this marriage, see K.P. Wentersdorf, 'The Clandestine Marriages of the Fair Maid of Kent', JMH 5 (1979), 203-19.

⁵⁶ See above, p. 11 footnote 42 and p. 80 footnote 53.

⁵⁷ That is, all but William de Bohun, Earl of Northampton.

⁵⁸ His father, John Clinton, though of limited means, had attained the title lord through his marriage to Ida d'Odingsells in 1290, the heiress of the castle and Lordship of Maxstoke. A veteran of the French and Scottish campaigns of Edward I, Lord Clinton was summoned to parliament in 1298, made a knight of the shire for Warwickshire in 1300 and made Constable of the castle of Wallingford in 1308. He died in 1310 leaving as his heir William's elder brother, John. CIPM ii, 143-44; CIPM iii, 186-87; CIPM v, 576.

favourite of Mortimer and Isabella.⁵⁹ Probably as a result of this favour, in 1328 he was allowed to marry Juliana le Blount, not only the heiress to the Leyburn inheritance,⁶⁰ but also twice widowed - and therefore twice dowered - the first as a result of her marriage to the son and heir apparent of the earl of Pembroke.⁶¹ For a man who had had a very limited annual income previously, then, this was most definitely a windfall. Moreover, the wealth of Clinton's wife also allowed Edward to hold off on giving him further patronage well into the 1330's, his only major grant prior to 1337 being that of the wardship of the manors of Brabourne, Cleydon, East Sutton, Sutton, and Salterns (Kent) of his stepson's estate as well as his wardship and an annuity of 200 marks per annum for the latter's maintenance.⁶²

But despite these arrangements, there were still many new men who needed good marriages during the course of the reign.⁶³ Though it should be noted that the king only held

⁵⁹ The most important duty Clinton appears to have performed for the Mortimer regime being to escort the Count of Hainault and his daughter, Philippa, to the new king. CPR 1327-30, 190.

⁶⁰ CPR 1327-30, 325; CCR 1327-30, 263; G.E.C, vi, 649. An estate of some fifteen manors and connected properties in Kent which had passed to Juliana upon the death of her grandmother in late 1327. CIPM v, 121-23.

⁶¹ CIPM vi, 385-93. Thomas le Blount, her second husband who died in 1328, seems to have had a far more limited estate, none of which was held in chief of the Crown. For Blount's career, see G.E.C. ii, 195.

⁶² CFR 1327-37, 245. In connection with the lands controlled by Juliana, he was also given the yearly fair at Elham (Kent), the control of Tottenham (Middlesex), another manor of the Hasting's wardship, and, for the sake of his wife, the wardship of the child, Laurence de Hastings. CCharR 1327-41, 259; CFR 1327-37, 360.

⁶³ Only two of these marriages can be seen as a result of arrangements made by someone other than the king. On 8 May 1331, a royal licence was granted to John Kirkton to marry

the right to consent to the marriage of widows - while in the case of female wards he had the right to arrange the actual marriage -⁶⁴ as seen in the case of the Manny and Frene matches discussed above, it was often a daring gambit not to seek the king's blessing first with such actions.⁶⁵ Thus, especially for those as dependent on royal good will as Edward's new men, the king's approval for any type of marriage was a necessity. And again, these marriages clearly reflected the need for a creation to firmly establish himself both in his sphere of influence as well as in the nobility as a whole. A typical example was the marriage of Roger Beauchamp to Sibyl Patshull at some time before 1337. Eldest of the four coheiressess of Sir William Patshull, her brother, and daughter of Sir John Patshull by Mabel de Grandson, daughter of Lord Grandson, Sibyl was, as a result of her lineage, a woman firmly planted within the English peerage. Moreover, the inheritance over which her husband would have control, though later to be subdivided, brought with it the manors of Chelsing (Hertfordshire), Bletsoe (Bedfordshire), Crawley (Buckinghamshire), and Stonegrave and Nunnington (Yorkshire) - all of not inconsiderable

Isabella, the wife of George Meriet, at Edward de Bohun's request. (CPR 1330-34, 114) The other was the result of a marriage arranged before October 1331 between John de Saint Philbert to Joan, daughter of Robert de Ufford. The wardship and marriage were granted to Ufford in 1334, though he seems to have gained control of Saint Philbert's estate before that. CPR 1330-34, 176; CPR 1334-38, 176; E401/314 (4 November 1333); E401/320 (7 July 1334).

⁶⁴ See Waugh, Lordship of England, 67-68, 86.

⁶⁵ Especially as the king still had considerable power over the descent of inheritances of tenants-in-chief, especially in connection with partitions. See Ward, English Women, 43-44. Waugh, 'Women's Inheritance', 83-92.

interest to a midlands knight on the rise.⁶⁶ Similar characteristics, moreover, marked the marriages of Thomas Musgrave to the widow of Robert Clifford and the daughter of Maurice Berkeley, John Montagu to the daughter of Thomas de Monthermer, and Robert de Benhale to the widow of both Thomas de Ufford and Thomas Audley and daughter and heir of John of Claveryng.⁶⁷

Obviously, though, the higher in Edward III's estimation a man stood, the more important a bride would be. Guy Brian, a man somewhat closer to the king than Beauchamp, benefited from a more lucrative marriage. In either 1349 or 1350, Brian, the son of Sir Guy de Brian of Walwyns Castle, was allowed to marry Elizabeth Despenser, twice widowed, once by Hugh Despenser (d.1349), and before that of Giles Badlesmere.⁶⁸ As a result, she held as dower from her first marriage to Badlesmere the manors of Barrow (Suffolk), Bourn, Laghton, South Highton and Westcote Drayton (Sussex), Plashes, Buckland, Mardley (Hertfordshire), two parts of the manor of Finmere (Oxfordshire), Erith, Kingeston, Ringwold, Siberton (Kent), and two parts of the manor of Preston (Buckinghamshire).⁶⁹ Add to this the jointure arrangements of her second marriage - which gave Brian control over the manor of Ashley (Hampshire), Stanford in the Vale (Berkshire), Shipton under Wynchwood and Barford (Oxfordshire), Sherston (Wiltshire), Martley (Worcestershire), Rotherfield (Sussex), the two parts of the

⁶⁶ CIPM x, 410-12.

⁶⁷ See Appendix 3b.

⁶⁸ G.E.C. ii, 361.

⁶⁹ CIPM viii, 139-47.

manor of Preston Bisset (Buckinghamshire) - and her dower lands from this marriage - which consisted of the castle, town, and manor of Neath, the castle and manor of Llanbleiddian (Glamorganshire) the castle and manor of Talyfan, the manor of Radyr, the castle and manor of Kenfig, the castle and manor of Hanley (Worcestershire) and the manor of Tewkesbury (Gloucestershire) with all connected lands and rights - ⁷⁰ and Elizabeth may be seen as a very profitable catch for a humble West Country knight. Moreover, simply the fact that Elizabeth was also a daughter of William Montagu, first earl of Salisbury and Catherine, daughter of William Lord Grandson, gave her husband a respectability otherwise inaccessible to someone of Brian's background.

Thomas Dagworth, the younger son of John Dagworth, a member of the Suffolk gentry and the usher of the Exchequer, made an even more spectacular rise. Dagworth himself had had very little to look forward to in terms of an inheritance, his father having held at his death only a small estate in East Anglia.⁷¹ However, as a result of his remarkable military ability, best seen whilst on campaign in Brittany in the 1340's, he became one of Edward's most famous war captains.⁷² To reward Dagworth, who was probably too young to benefit from the first round of patronage taking place in

⁷⁰ CIPM ix, 328-42.

⁷¹ Dagworth's father held at his death the manor of Bradwell (Essex) and various other lands in Suffolk and Essex. CIPM vii, 310-11.

⁷² For a good overview of Dagworth's career, see M. Jones, 'Sir Thomas Dagworth et la guerre civile en Bretagne au XIV siecle: quelques documents inedits', Annales de Bretagne et des Pays de l'Ouest lxxxvii (1980), 621-36.

the 1330's,⁷³ in 1343, the king allowed him to marry the widow of the Earl of Ormond, Elizabeth, second surviving daughter of Humphrey de Bohun, Earl of Hereford and Essex, and Elizabeth, daughter of Edward I.⁷⁴ For someone of Dagworth's background, this was no mean advance, bringing him into the upper levels of the nobility literally overnight, at least in terms of income.⁷⁵ But it is notable that, unlike Brian, this was the only patronage Dagworth would get - the king, probably rightly, feeling control over an entire earldom was a more than generous gift for one of his war captains.⁷⁶ Indeed, the only major gain independent of his marriage was a payment of 25000 florins for the capture of Charles le Blois, duke of Brittany, in 1347.⁷⁷

⁷³ The first mention of Dagworth in the published documents is on 3 October 1337, when he was given a royal protection for going abroad on the king's service. CPR 1334-38, 531. Jones does not make mention of any activities of note by Dagworth prior to 1341. See also Jones, 'Sir Thomas Dagworth', 624; A. Ayton, Knights and Warhorses: Military Service and the English Aristocracy under Edward III (1994), 161.

⁷⁴ G.E.C. iv, 28.

⁷⁵ Though she did not control the wardship and marriage of her son (see above, pp. 76-77) she did control her dower lands including the manors of Finborough (Suffolk), Twyford, Great Linford, and three parts of the manor of Ayelsbury (Buckinghamshire), Smeetham Hall (Essex), Rotherfield Peppard (Oxfordshire), Cold Ashton (Gloucestershire), Sopley (Hampshire), Long Compton (Warwickshire), Weeton (Lancashire), Kilpeck (Herefordshire), and Shere and 'la Vacherie' (Surrey), most of which seem to have been held in jointure and entail to Ormond and his wife. CCR 1337-39, 341, 345, 348, 349.

⁷⁶ Rather, any other royal patronage which the couple received was primarily directed at the wife - mainly, annuities granted before the marriage. See CCR 1341-43, 301; CCR 1343-46, 300-01.

⁷⁷ Paid in instalments. CPR 1348-50, 146. For payments see E403/344/3; E403/344/28; E403/347/11; E403/353/2; E403/353/16. That his wife continued to be paid the instalments of this after her husband's death may be a mark of favour again to his wife. E403/362/18; E403/362/27.

But perhaps one of the most important examples of a new man's marriage during the reign was that of the union between William de Bohun and Elizabeth, widow of Edmund Mortimer (d.1332) and coheir to the Badlesmere inheritance in 1335.⁷⁸ Indeed, not only did Bohun get control over part of the Badlesmere inheritance,⁷⁹ as well as a dower portion of her husband's lands,⁸⁰ but probably in connection with his wife's affiliation with the Mortimers, in April of 1336 Bohun was given control of part of the wardship of the heir to the estate, which included the manors of Clebury Mortimer and Earnwood (Shropshire), the reversion of the manor of Arley (Staffordshire), and the manor of Bisley (Gloucestershire).⁸¹ In September of the same year, he also gained control in a similar way of the castle of Wigmore, the ancient home of the Mortimers.⁸² This grant, then, had a considerable impact upon the holdings of Bohun, and made him more able to uphold the rank of earl which he received in March of the next year.⁸³

⁷⁸ For the background to this marriage, see Holmes, Estates, 43-44.

⁷⁹ Her pourparty amounted to the manor of Erith (Kent), Drayton (Sussex), two parts of the manor of Finmere (Oxfordshire), the manor of Plashes (Hertfordshire) and a fourth of the manor of Thaxsted (Essex). CIPM viii, 146-47; Holmes, Estates, 17, 23. Many of these manors were held in dower by Elizabeth de Brian. See above, pp. 84-85.

⁸⁰ Mainly made up of Maelienydd and Comot Deuddwr. CFR 1327-37, 325; see also Holmes, Estates, 14.

⁸¹ CPR 1334-38, 252. These were lands originally granted by Roger Mortimer at the time of Elizabeth de Badlesmere's marriage to Edmund Mortimer in exchange for £2000 paid by Badlesmere's father. For the actual marriage contract, see Holmes, Estates, 121-22. See also below, p. 99.

⁸² On 23 September 1336, Hugh, bishop of Lincoln was ordered to give up keeping of the castle of Wigmore. CFR 1327-37, 495.

⁸³ CCharR 1327-41, 401, 484-85. Though Bohun still seems to have needed more help than the other 1337 earls. See Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 37.

All these marriages of Edward's new men, then, had certain things in common. They almost all entailed the marriages between those unequal in wealth, if not rank. Of the thirty-three marriages which took place during the reign, twenty-six were identifiably with women of peerage stock. Moreover, it is notable that almost all of the marriages took place before a man had been summoned to parliament or otherwise promoted,⁸⁴ perhaps indicating again the realization by Edward III that he had to buttress his new men's social and financial ranks before they came to be ennobled. Finally, over half the women Edward allowed his new men to marry were widows - including the wives of William Bohun, Thomas Musgrave, Thomas Dagworth, Michael Poyning, Guy Brian and Walter Manny. After all, such matches were potentially the most lucrative of all marriages, these women often bringing with them not only inheritances, but also the dower portions of a husband's, or husbands', estate.⁸⁵

More generally, Edward III's use of the royal feudal right of marriage - whether as a grant of the right of marriage of an heir or heiress to a new man or the arrangement of his own marriage - helped to reinforce his new creations' positions within the kingdom. At one level, it helped to build up the estates of new men which the king had gradually been developing for them by allowing them control over more land through their wives' inheritances or

⁸⁴ Compare Appendix 1 and 3b.

⁸⁵ See Archer, 'Rich Old Ladies', 15-31. Though frequently increases in the size of a new man's estate did not extend beyond his lifetime. See below, p. 211 footnote 24.

through the marriages of their offspring to their wards. Whether it be Roger Beauchamp's marriage to Sibyl Patshull or Thomas Dagworth's to the countess of Ormond, a marriage almost always increased the size of a new man's estate substantially - and usually, as with escheats, forfeitures, and expectancies, in an area where a new man had previous interests.⁸⁶

But Edward's control over the royal right of marriage of noblewomen for his new creations was of more importance than simply being a way to increase the estate size of his new men. It also gave them a status and presence within their sphere of influence which only came with attachment to established noble blood.⁸⁷ After all, at the beginning of the reign not a few of these men were of humble origins, often little better off than their tenants or those over whom they would later yield power - especially when it is remembered that Edward's new men often gained many of their holdings before being raised to parliament. Thus, though they might increase the size of their estates, it was not simply this which would ennoble them. In the highly traditional society which existed in medieval England, a society bound by ties of blood and heredity, wealth and landholding alone was not enough to make a man noble - at least in the eyes of his contemporaries.⁸⁸ Rather, marriage was one of the few routes through which respectability might come quickly to the more

⁸⁶ Though the often varied holdings of their new brides could also create new areas of interest for them. See Appendix 8.

⁸⁷ See also Ward, English Noblewomen, 21.

⁸⁸ Though it seems to have been the most important criterion for an individual summons to parliament. See above, pp. 21-23.

humble.⁸⁹ Indeed, by allowing his new men to marry their sons and daughters into more well established lines, as well as licensing their marriage into the lines themselves, Edward III helped his new men gain access to a respectability within county and court circles which, even with all the other royal patronage they received, they would have had difficulty in achieving otherwise.

And finally, this marriage policy helped to heal the wounds resulting from the events of 1320's.⁹⁰ Indeed, by arranging, or at the very least consenting to, the marriages of these new men to previously troublesome families, Edward was in essence helping to reconcile wayward nobles with the increasingly 'new' political elite of the realm. This is seen in the marriage between William de Bohun and Elizabeth de Badlesmere, as Rosenthal notes.⁹¹ Badlesmere was the widow of Roger Mortimer, a man whose father Bohun had taken part in the coup against, and which seems to have caused a running quarrel between the two families. As a result, the marriage may be seen not only as helping cause better relations between the Mortimers and the king, in whose name Bohun acted, but also the Mortimers and Bohuns. This, then, along with the marriage of Elizabeth Despenser to Guy de Brian in 1349/50, and the acceptance of the marriage of Ralph Stafford to Margaret Audley, may together be taken as a concerted attempt to unite the fortunes, and therefore

⁸⁹ A point made by DeAragon in her article on marriage in Norman England. DeAragon, 'In Pursuit of Aristocratic Women', 260-61.

⁹⁰ For marriage as a way of smoothing over disputes, see Ward, English Noblewomen, 20-21.

⁹¹ Rosenthal, 'Aristocratic Marriage and the English Peerage,' 186.

outlooks, of the most important 'troublesome' families of the previous reign with those most trusted of Edward's new men.

Thus, while in the end we must look at marriage as one of the most inconsistent parts of Edward's patronage programme - dependent, as it was, to at least some degree on personal compatibility - nonetheless, as with the sources in Chapter Two, Edward seems to managed to make accommodations for his new men so that they could find geographically and socially acceptable matches. Though the king did not neglect his own interests on this point,⁹² he did seem to make a genuine attempt to allow his new men to gain access to marriage arrangements which had the potential of furthering their social and economic standing. In other words, the woman a new man married, as much as any other single factor, helped to assure him his place within the nobility of the realm.

⁹² See p. 204.

CHAPTER FOUR Wardships

Long term grants, however, whether they be of escheats, forfeitures, expectancies or marriages, were only part of what Edward used to aid his new creations. He also exploited sources open to him which provided less permanent grants, yet nonetheless could help give his new men adequate patronage for most of the course of their careers. First among these was wardship.¹ Wardship, referred to in the Dialogus de Scaccario as "'escheat with heir'",² was the holding of the body and/or lands of minors or anyone so incapacitated as not to be able to perform the relevant feudal services.³ From these the guardian could usually take some form of profit,⁴ provided he left enough to sustain the heir and that the lands of the wardship involved were not hurt, or 'wasted', by these exactions.⁵ If the estate of a ward comprised lands

¹ For a discussion of the feudal right of wardship, see Pollock and Maitland, History of English Law, i, 318-29; S.F.C. Milsom, Historical Foundations of the Common Law (1969) 93-97; Baker, Introduction to English Legal History, 275-76.

² Dialogus de Scaccario, trans. C. Johnson (1950), 94.

³ An example of the latter is the guardianship of an individual due to 'idiocy'. See CIPM x, 318-20; also see S.L. Waugh, 'The Fiscal Uses of Royal Wardships in the Reign of Edward I' in P.R. Coss and S.D. Lloyd, eds., Thirteenth Century England I: Proceedings of the Newcastle upon Tyne Conference, 1985 (1986), 54. The age of majority was twenty-one for male heirs, sixteen for unmarried female heirs and fourteen for married heiresses - though this could vary or the wardship could be granted to the individual involved, such as when Edward II granted William Montagu the wardship of his own estate. Simpson, History of the Land Law, 17-18; for the Montagu wardship, see CIPM viii, 513; CCR 1318-23, 287; CFR 1319-27, 56. Control of the body of the heir was usually connected with the right of marriage. See above, p. 68 footnote 1.

⁴ On the down side, the guardian was also responsible for all debts of the deceased, including those incurred by his ancestors. S.S. Walker, 'Royal Wardship in Medieval England', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Chicago (1966), 44.

⁵ See Holt, Magna Carta, 213-16; Waugh, Lordship of England, 79-80, 233-34. The guardian also had to find sustenance for

held of several lords, as was often the case, these rights would be divided according to lordship, though control of the body of the heir and any connected marriage rights would be given to the lord holding the oldest enfeoffment - a policy known as "priority of enfeoffment".⁶ However, if but a fraction of the land was held of royal lordship, then 'prerogative wardship' came into play. This meant that not only all lands held of the king by a deceased tenant-in-chief, as well as the body of his heir, returned to royal custodianship, but also all other lands held by the deceased of any lord whatsoever.⁷

Though the latter right could obviously be detrimental to the immediate lords of those holding of the king, and thereby a potential source of complaint, in general the concept of royal wardship seems to have survived, though somewhat modified, Magna Carta and subsequent legal changes taking place in thirteenth century.⁸ Indeed, rather than specifically targeting over-zealous interpretation of royal

any siblings of the ward, thus making a wardship grant of an heir from a large family potentially less lucrative. See Walker, 'Royal Wardship', 21.

⁶ First made into law with the Statute of Westminster in 1285. Bean, Decline of English Feudalism, 15.

⁷ Waugh, Lordship of England, 72-79. See also Bean, Decline of Feudalism, 9-10; Milsom, 'The Origin of Prerogative Wardship', 223-44. The king also had the advantage of being able to seize estates on the slightest suspicion of lands being held in chief. As a result, at times a wardship was retained by the king "in default of challenge". See Walker, 'Royal Wardship', 36. Also, it should be noted that the guardian often had control of the wards of wards. Waugh, Lordship of England, 77.

⁸ Clauses 3-5 of the Magna Carta deals with wardships, most notably concerning majority fines and wastage. Holt, Magna Carta, appendix iv, 319. The more notable examples of later changes being in the Provisions of Merton (1235-36), the Statute of Marlborough (1267) and the first Statute of Westminster (1275). See Walker, 'Royal Wardship', 37.

rights, any restrictions placed on wardship in this period were more generally aimed at protecting all types of heirs and their estates - such as rules concerning waste, disparagement of wards and forced remarriage of widows - or attempting to close loopholes used to avoid wardships.⁹ Indeed, the only substantial criticisms levelled solely against the king's use of the right during the century previous to Edward III's accession was when it was seen as being granted away to undeserving individuals.¹⁰

Thus, as with marriage, Edward III had a firm control over the right of wardship at the beginning of his rule - as well as set precedent in its usage as a form of royal patronage.¹¹ Indeed, Edward's different uses of this right reflect well Waugh's divisions of wardship for the previous century, and so will be used in the ensuing discussion.¹² The

⁹ The nature of this series of acts seems to imply that wardship was a two way street which was open to abuse by guardian (eg. waste, disparagement) and heir (eg. marriages without the guardian's approval) alike - an idea reflected, though somewhat inversely, in Waugh's theme that wardship could also be of benefit to all parties concerned. Waugh, Lordship of England, 10, 208-213.

¹⁰ Waugh mentions the complaints voiced as a result of Henry III's treatment of his foreign favourites as evidence of this. S.L. Waugh, 'Marriage, Class, and Royal Lordship in England under Henry III', Viator (1985), 198-206; see also Walker, 'Royal Wardship', 39. Ridgeway further makes a distinction between the early patronage to the Savoyards and the later grants to the Poitevins, which tended to be the more heavily criticized of the two. H.W. Ridgeway, 'Foreign Favourites and Henry III's Problems of Patronage, 1247-1258', EHR civ (1989), 590-610.

¹¹ For examples of the use of wardships in previous reigns, see Lally, 'Secular Patronage', 163-67; S.D. Church, 'The Rewards of Royal Service in the Household of King John: A Dissenting Opinion', EHR cxxxvi (1995), 289-91; Waugh, 'Fiscal Uses of Royal Wardships', 55-57; Waugh, Lordship of England, 180-93.

¹² Waugh, Lordship of England, 155. This was an extension on earlier practice when there seems to have been basically two types of wardship grant - partial wardship and full wardship. Partial wardship amounted to the farming of lands with

different classifications of wardship grant to Edward's new creations were, then, fivefold.¹³ Of the seventy-four grants of land in wardship to Edward's new men between 1330 and 1377, nineteen were straight gifts with no attached charges; forty were grants with some type of annual remuneration to the king; one was by lease; four were by sale; three were by simple custodianship of the land;¹⁴ five were a mixture of these types - or cases where the terms of a grant were later changed; and in two cases, the terms of the grant are unknown.¹⁵

Straight grants were often the most lucrative form of wardship patronage for a new man, being, as they were, free from all charges save those connected with the upkeep of the land and provision for the heir. As a result, the holder of such a wardship could count on making a profit on all normal and feudal revenues connected with the estate. Eleven of Edward's creations received the sum total, nineteen, of such grants. Typical of these was the 1349 grant to Guy Brian of the wardship and marriage of the heir of William de Welle,

payment of a set annual sum to the exchequer. Full wardship was the guardianship of an estate without any such payments and with control over any rights connected with the wardship. See Lally, 'Secular Patronage', 163-64.

¹³ Often, in the case of wardships, whether the dower portion later also came to an individual was dependent upon how generous the king was feeling. Thus, many wardships only comprised two-thirds of the lands of an estate. See also Waugh, Lordship of England, 145.

¹⁴ Though one of the grants noted, that to Roger Chaundos in February of 1331 of Abergavenny and connected properties, was granted to someone else within the month. CFR 1327-37, 235, 243.

¹⁵ These terms do not necessarily coincide with the wording of the actual grants. Rather I have categorized them with respect to the services due and have attached the category which closest resembles these services and the predominant usage of the term.

tenant-in-chief, "without rendering anything for the same".¹⁶ Welle was a member of the upper gentry, and his estate upon his death consisted of the manors of Great Sampford and East Tilbury (Essex), Exning (Suffolk), as well as lands in Cambridgeshire and the March of Wales.¹⁷ In this case, because the estate was small enough, all rights of wardship could conveniently go to one individual. However, when more important wardships came open, as in the case of an estate of the titled nobility, land was usually granted out in parcels.¹⁸ Hence, when William Bohun was granted lands of the earl of Kent in Hampshire in 1331, the grant comprised only the farm of the town of Basingstoke (worth £80. 16s. per year) and £20 of rent payable by the prior of Bath to the barton in the town of Basingstoke.¹⁹ Edward's new men benefited from the earl of Atholl's estate in a similar manner. David de Strathbolgi's father, one of the 'disinherited', had been slain in the forest of Kilblane in 1335, leaving his three year old son as a royal ward. Therefore, for the next twenty years, until 1355, the Atholl inheritance was in the hands of the king, to do with as he pleased. Two of Edward's new men profited from this wardship. In June of 1336, while both men were apparently on campaign in the north, Edward granted Walter de Manny "for his free service to the king", the manors of Stiffkey and Holkham (Norfolk), both of which had been part of the late earl of

¹⁶ CPR 1348-50, 283.

¹⁷ CIPM ix, 322-23.

¹⁸ For the reasoning for this, see below, pp. 104-10.

¹⁹ CPR 1330-34, 217; CCR 1330-33, 459. This was granted by Bohun to Richard de la Pole in 1337. CPR 1334-38, 563; CPR 1338-40, 3, 447.

Atholl's estate, and which he was now to hold "rent free during the minority of the heir."²⁰ Later, in 1343, John de Stryvelyn, one of Edward's northern supporters, probably again in connection with service in Scotland, was granted £20 rent in the towns of Kilham, Foston, Thwing, Fiveley Nook, Thixendale "and other towns" in Yorkshire, which had been of the estate of the earl of Pembroke but which later had come into Atholl's hands by inheritance.²¹

Grants free of payments were, however, obviously the most expensive type of wardship grants to the royal purse, and made up less than a third of all wardships given out. Rather, the most common type of wardship patronage were those referred to as commitments in Appendix 4. In essence, any grant the terms of which called for some form of remuneration to the king - often the rate at which it had been extended during the inquisition post mortem -²² the commitment was nonetheless a very profitable form of patronage, allowing, as

²⁰ CPR 1334-38, 266. These manors had been granted to Manny in fee during the previous year, while the earl of Atholl was in disgrace for rebellion, but were restored to him in August of 1335. CPR 1334-38, 91; CCR 1333-37, 392; CPR 1334-38, 176.

²¹ CPR 1343-45, 47, 57. Though not specifically designated a gift in the wording of the grant, that it comprised of rent, and that Stryvelyn did not control the body of the heir or any lands, meant that more than likely it was free of charges.

²² For example, the payment at the yearly rent at the Exchequer of £47. 19s. "at which the manor is extended by John de Peyto the younger, escheator" for the manor of Kingsland (Herefordshire) until the lawful age of the Mortimer heir. CPR 1327-37, 407. This rate was usually lower than the actual annual value of the land. E.R. Stevenson, 'The Escheator', in EGW, ii, 137; see p. 28 footnote 1. Sometimes the payment of charges and services, in addition to the extent, could also be specified. CPR 1356-68, 142. There could, however, be less fixed arrangements, as when Roger de Beauchamp was granted the wardship of the lands late of Herbert de Saint Quintin "rendering as much as others will render, and as shall be agreed on between the treasurer and him". CPR 1347-56, 35.

it often did, any profits beyond this amount to go into the guardian's pocket.²³ A typical example would be the 3 November 1337 grant to Reginald de Cobham of the estate of John de Dokersworth, this time a member of the lesser gentry, of the manor of King's Walden and a parcel of land held by John Veer, both in Hertfordshire, to hold during the minority of the heir and "rendering yearly at the exchequer as much as others will render in moieties at Easter and Michaelmas".²⁴ Again, this wardship was small enough to be granted out in its entirety, and again, more important wardships tended to be granted out in parcels. Perhaps one of the most well used estates in this respect is that of Edmund Mortimer.²⁵ Son of the executed earl of March, Mortimer had, with the support of the Lords, received back part of his father's estate in late 1331.²⁶ However, he died a few months later, and the wardship of his three year old son, Roger, and his estate escheated to the king. Though some of this estate was granted out as gifts, much also went out as commitments. On 30 April 1334,

²³ Moreover, there were times when the amounts due were respited, or even forgiven, by the king. Thomas Bradeston was a particularly favoured peer in this respect, receiving such pardons constantly throughout his career. For specific examples touching Bradeston, see CCR 1333-37, 468, 528; CPR 1334-38, 180, 471. However, when the grant involved was a lease or farm, non-payment of dues could incur strict penalties. For example, Robert de Ufford, earl of Suffolk, leased the wardship of the estate of John de Bernak in 1346, agreeing that if "the farm or any part thereof ever be in arrear fifteen days after the day of payment the earl binds himself and his heirs to pay in the chamber £200 then and every time the farm fall into arrear". CPR 1345-48, 144.

²⁴ CFR 1337-47, 57; CIPM ix, 61.

²⁵ The other major commitment of this period, that of the estate, save a dower portion, of the earl of Desmond, granted to Ralph Stafford in 1358, came to an end quickly thereafter. While Desmond's eldest son had been classified an idiot, his next son was of age and received livery of the lands involved within the year. CFR 1356-68, 65; G.E.C. iv, 243.

²⁶ RP ii, 62; CPR 1330-34, 193.

Thomas Bradeston was granted the manor of Kingsland (Herefordshire) during the minority of Roger Mortimer, for which he was to pay £47. 19s. rent at the exchequer,²⁷ and, in the next month, Hugh de Frene, a knight of Hereford and later of some fame as the abductor of the countess of Lincoln,²⁸ was granted the manor of Orleton (Herefordshire) on similar terms rendering £52. 7s. 8d. to the exchequer.²⁹ Unsurprisingly, William Bohun, who married Edmund Mortimer's widow in 1335,³⁰ was more substantially favoured with Mortimer lands, not only receiving in wardship the manors of Clebury Mortimer and Earnwood (Shropshire), the reversion of the manor of Arley (Staffordshire) and the manor of Bisley (Gloucestershire), apparently free of all rents and services,³¹ but also the Mortimer *caput honoris* of Wigmore (Herefordshire) "rendering yearly at the exchequer as much as H. bishop of Lincoln . . . used to render".³² Finally, on 6 September 1341, Bohun and his wife were granted another part of the Mortimer estate, the keeping of the castle of Knucklas and Pilleth in the Welsh marches, which had been held by John Daucok for 100s per annum, and which they were to pay, as well as a 20s. increment.³³

²⁷ CFR 1327-37, 407. Four years later this was regranted to him free of rent as compensation for the manor of Knolle. CCR 1337-39, 338. See also Appendix 2.

²⁸ See above, pp. 79-80.

²⁹ CFR 1327-37, 401, 409.

³⁰ See above, pp. 86-87.

³¹ CPR 1334-38, 252; for more about this set of manors, see above, pp. 86-87.

³² CFR 1327-37, 495.

³³ CFR 1337-47, 239-40. On the odd occasion, a wardship would start out with the terms of a commitment and then be changed to those of a grant. On 6 May 1342 Guy Brian was granted the wardship of the estate of Ralph le Butler, tenant-in-chief, until the heir came of age, rendering the extent thereof twice a year. This estate - including manors in Bedfordshire,

The remaining wardships which Edward granted out all had somewhat more substantial remuneration for the king attached to them - though rarely, unless it was a simple stewardship, was the grantee not able to make some form of profit from the transaction.³⁴ Indeed, though the wardships granted by lease or sale were rarely the most immediately profitable, they nonetheless could be very lucrative to those so favoured. These were mainly of the nature of the control of specific parts of an estate, as when, on 23 June 1357, Reginald de Cobham was allowed, for £100 fine payable at the exchequer, to have control of a moiety of the manor of Ixworth (Suffolk) of the estate of William Criketot during the minority of the heir, "provided that he do the real charges and services due to the king and others from the said moiety".³⁵ Similarly the acquisition in 1336, for a fine of 1000 marks, of the guardianship of the manors of Bromsgrove (Worcestershire), Worthy Martyr (Hampshire) and the bailiwick of the manor of Bromsgrove³⁶ by William Montagu was, considering that the Mortimer heir was included in the price, something of a

Lincolnshire, Staffordshire, Shropshire, Warwickshire and Wiltshire - was five years later granted to him free of all such charges, as well as with a forgiveness of all payments in arrears. Commitments, then, could be a step along the road to a more wide ranging control of a wardship, though this was more often the exception than the rule. CFR 1337-47, 280; CPR 1345-48, 259; CIPM viii, 247-48.

³⁴ Waugh gives the example in the reign of Edward II of grants of wardships given to Hugh Despenser the younger and Ingram de Berenger, the former potentially being able to make £204 above the payment he made as a fine for the wardship and the latter £105. Waugh, Lordship of England, 185.

³⁵ CFR 1356-68, 41. Payment on the fine was made in June 1357 and February 1359. E401/442 (30 June 1357); E401/449 (8 February 1359).

³⁶ CFR 1327-37, 488-89.

bargain.³⁷ And, on the odd occasion, the king would even allow a new creation to buy the entire wardship of a dead tenant-in-chief - for example, the estate of Robert de Pavely, acquired by Guy Brian in December 1346 for the price of 250 marks and comprising the manors of Ruddington (Nottinghamshire) and Paulerspury and Great Houghton (Northamptonshire), as well as the marriage of the heir.³⁸ Such extensive control, however, was the exception rather than the rule.³⁹

Indeed, what this last section tends to emphasize is the contemporary realization of the obvious value of minorities, men being willing to pay large sums to have even portions of wardships under their control.⁴⁰ But again, to understand why

³⁷ See above, p. 77. This is also one of the few cases, probably marking Montagu's favour with the king as well as the price he paid, where Edward not only made the grant until an heir, of whatever generation, came of age, but also of compensation if the properties granted did not yield a certain amount to the guardian. CFR 1327-37, 489.

³⁸ CFR 1337-47, 494, 495. CIPM viii, 487-88. Payments made 8 February 1347 £100 (E401/387); and 5 March 1347 £66. 13s. 4d. (E403/387). It is, moreover, notable, that, as the reign progressed, the number of wardship grants free of all charges decreased, probably reflecting the fact that they were becoming in increasingly short supply. See Appendix 4; for another rationale for this change, see above, p. 70 footnote 11.

³⁹ See Waugh, Lordship of England, 149.

⁴⁰ This may also have had something to do with the decreasing number of lands in wardship available to the king mainly due to the rise of jointure and enfeoffment to use during this period - both of which would have made guardianships an increasingly scarce, and therefore increasingly valuable, commodity. For the growth of the use of such devices during the reign, see Bean, Decline of Feudalism, 104-79. This is perhaps reflected in the decreasing number of wardship grants to Edward's new men as the reign progressed: 30 from 1331-40, 24 from 1341-50, 10 from 1351-60, 8 from 1351-60, and 8 from 1361-70, and 3 from 1370-77. See Appendix 4.

grants went where they did, we must first look to a new man's interests. In such matters, grants dictated by blood relationships rarely seems to have been a factor in influencing royal wardship granting practices.⁴¹ In only case, that of the grant of the estate of John Brewes to Thomas Brewes on account of the idiocy of the former, can blood lineage have said to have played a significant part in determining the fate of a grant.⁴² Rather, various in-law relationships were easily the more important determinant. After all, to control the lands of one's in-laws not only helped protect them from harmful guardianship,⁴³ but also enhanced one's power and position within the extended family - an especially important consideration for those new men who had married above their previous station. Indeed, the fact that a new man now had control of the lands of those who were before often his social superiors must have gone some way to ameliorating his low birth, or at least his previously undistinguished position. Whether it be the control of

⁴¹ As with the grants of marriage rights. See above, p. 75.

⁴² Moreover, this grant is also somewhat unusual in that the way in which the estate was to be treated was specifically noted in the text of the grant, namely that it should be held "without any waste, destruction or impoverishment . . . as well as maintaining and repairing all houses and enclosures of the said lands and doing all other charges incumbent thereon". CFR 1356-68, 42. Indeed, from later entries concerning this grant, there seems to have been more than an element of compassion on the king's part in his treatment of the estate. See also CCR 1364-68, 97-98.

⁴³ For a discussion of the concept of 'waste', see S.S. Walker, 'The Action of Waste in the Early Common Law', in J.H. Baker, ed., Legal Records and the Historian (1978), 185-206. Though it should be noted that mistreatment of a wardship can as easily result from neglect as from a deliberate attempt to extract undue profit. See Thomas Bradeston's treatment of a manor of the Giffard wardship. CCR 1330-33, 387.

Dispenser lands by Brian,⁴⁴ of Pembroke lands by Clinton,⁴⁵ or even of Mortimer lands by Bohun,⁴⁶ guardianship placed those so favoured in a more powerful position, one which was, however, a necessity for a "new man" to be able to stand his ground in an "old family".⁴⁷

But it is notable that Edward seems to have made even in-law relationships the main criteria with grants only to the most favoured of his creations. In only ten out of seventy-four grants could such relationships be said to have played a major role in the fate of grants.⁴⁸ Otherwise, a new man's geographical sphere of influence again seems to have dictated the identity of lands given out. After all, as noted with previous sources, it was pointless giving a new man land which was too far from his power base, as it made both care

⁴⁴ CFR 1347-56, 109, 257-58; CCR 1349-54, 17-18; CPR 1348-50, 578, 579.

⁴⁵ CFR 1327-37, 245; CCharR 1327-41, 259; CFR 1327-37, 360. He was also granted, for the sake of his wife, the wardship of her child, Laurence de Hastings. CCR 1333-37, 215.

⁴⁶ CPR 1334-38, 252; CFR 1327-37, 495; CFR 1337-47, 239-41.

⁴⁷ Similarly, the control of the wardship of a prospective daughter or son-in-law would obviously again help to improve the position of the new creation within the family, as in the royal grant of the wardship of the lands of the heir of the earl of Ormond to John Darcy, his future father-in-law. CFR 1337-47, 465-66; G.E.C. x, 121.

⁴⁸ By family relationships, what is meant is one's immediate family or those who married in. When one passes, however, the second degree, one has to wonder whether other factors - such as royal favour, geography or perhaps even affinity - were the main issues. Concerning the latter, though there is little to link the grant of wardships to the affinity of a "new man", it must be borne in mind that there is a lack of evidence on this score, especially when it comes to the composition of a banneret's affinity. Saying this, affinity and geography would have been so interconnected - an affinity usually having been determined by geography - that it is difficult, for lack of other evidence, to give affinity relationships alone the deciding role in the distribution of wardship grants. This, however, goes against Holmes' more general conclusion of the "willingness of the king to allow estates during minorities to be administered by the officials of a dead tenant-in-chief". Holmes, Estates, 46.

and control of the land difficult. But this was even more true when it came to wardships, which entailed attempting to protect and control land which everyone knew was to be in custodianship, and therefore in practice less well defended by law.⁴⁹ It was therefore in the interests of all involved - new man, king, and even ward - that the person had the strength within the area to defend his charge.

First of all, however, it must be recognized that part of what made wardships useful in this respect was the set precedent which allowed large estates to be broken up into smaller parts.⁵⁰ Indeed, unless for exceptional cases, rarely was a new man, no matter how favoured, granted the entire estate of a member of the higher nobility, much less the body and marriage of the heir. Almost all wardships of the titled nobility granted to Edward's new peers - those of the earldoms of Kent, Pembroke, Atholl, and Ormond as well as the estate of Roger and Edmund Mortimer and the elder and younger Despencers - were broken up to be made into relevant smaller grants to individuals both within and outside Edward's new creations. Within Edward's new peerage creations, they accounted for twenty-two of seventy-four wardships granted between the years 1330 and 1377. One of the most well used estates in this respect was that of the Mortimers, Roger and his son Edmund, which was divided into some six different wardship grants within the new peerage alone. Some were of only a manor or two, such as when Thomas de Bradeston was

⁴⁹ Indeed, wardships seem to have been the perfect time to assert dormant rights. See below, pp. 166-67.

⁵⁰ Waugh, Lordship of England, 149.

granted the keeping of the manor of Kingsland,⁵¹ or Hugh de Frene, granted the manor of Orleton, both in Herefordshire.⁵² More important individuals, however, received greater responsibilities. William Montagu's purchase/grant of part of the Mortimer estate in 1336, and William Bohun grant of Mortimer lands in the same year, both mentioned previously, gave two of Edward's closest companions considerable, though not exclusive, control over the estate of the late earl of March. Indeed, the only new creation given an entire estate was John Darcy, granted the earldom of Kildare in Ireland in 1332, and this, in all likelihood, was in connection not only with his marriage three years earlier to the widow of Thomas FitzJohn, Earl of Kildare,⁵³ but also of his hold on the justiciarship of Ireland.⁵⁴

This ability, then, along with the fact that the rule of prerogative wardship brought most sizable estates into the king's custody at some point or other during the reign,⁵⁵ not only allowed the king to favour more men, but also to tailor the grants to fit them. Perhaps one of the most notable example of this is the grant of seven wardships to Thomas

⁵¹ CFR 1327-37, 407.

⁵² CFR 1327-37, 401, 409.

⁵³ It is not recorded as to whether Darcy got the body of the heir. CFR 1327-37, 300-01. See also D'Arcy, Life of John First Baron Darcy, 49, 61. The king also sometimes made a grant of wards of wards. In 1350, Guy de Brian was granted the wardships of the estates of John de Nerberd, John Aune, Thomas Joel of Joelston, and of Christina le Flemyng, all situated in South Wales and all holding by knight service of the Despenser heir, also a minor, giving a total of £14. 3s. 4d. yearly for the lands to the treasurer of the wardrobe. CFR 1347-56, 257-58.

⁵⁴ See Appendix 6.

⁵⁵ Though jointure and enfeoffment to use were obviously to have an effect in this respect. See above, p. 101 footnote 40.

Bradeston, mostly in Gloucestershire or neighbouring counties.⁵⁶ First, in January of 1331, Bradeston was granted the keeping of the manors of Lechlade and Siddington Musard and two parts of the manor of Barnsley (Gloucestershire) of the earl of Kent's estate.⁵⁷ In December of the same year, he was further given, apparently free of charges,⁵⁸ the whole of the estate, along with the marriage, of the heir of John Giffard of Weston Subedge, an estate which included lands in Gloucestershire, Wiltshire, Somerset, Dorset, as well as Surrey, Oxford and Wales.⁵⁹ Next, on 6 January 1334, the custody of the manor of Colvillesthyng (Hampshire), late of John Westcote, was committed to him as a result of the idiocy of the heir, though with provision to sustain the same.⁶⁰ In April, along with a number of Edward's other new men, Bradeston came to benefit from the Mortimer estate, being committed the manor of Kingsland (Herefordshire).⁶¹ Several years passed before his next grant, when on 7 May 1341 he was committed the whole of the Gloucestershire estate of William de la More at the rate of £7. 15s.⁶² The following wardship was a bit further afield, being the commitment to Bradeston, and Maurice de Berkeley, of the Suffolk estate of Cecily,

⁵⁶ See Appendices 4 and 8.

⁵⁷ Paying £150. 13s. 8d. a year. CFR 1327-37, 225; for the extents of these manors, see Inquisitions Post Mortem for Gloucestershire v, 228-31. On 13 October 1331 this was extended to "from heir to heir". CFR 1327-37, 277. The wardship ended on 10 April 1351. CCR 1349-54, 295.

⁵⁸ When payments are expected they are almost always mentioned in the grant.

⁵⁹ CPR 1330-34, 228. Bradeston had claims on part of the Giffard lands dating back to the Minority. CPR 1327-30, 146.

⁶⁰ CPR 1330-34, 493.

⁶¹ CFR 1327-37, 407; see above, pp. 98-99.

⁶² CFR 1337-47, 200, 211; CCR 1341-43, 69. For a fuller look at the history behind this wardship, see above, pp. 73-74.

widow of Brian de Hikelyng, until the lawful age of Joan her daughter, "rendering yearly at the Exchequer the extent thereof".⁶³ Finally, ending this string of grants, in October 1350, Bradeston was granted the commitment of the manor of Frampton (Gloucestershire) of the estate of Henry de Welyngton for the sum of 20 marks yearly.⁶⁴ Thus, by the use of wardships and in the space of two decades, Edward had managed to augment substantially the more permanent landed estate which Bradeston had been developing in southern, and especially southwestern, England.

But wardships were not just important as a way to help the more humble of the new men on the rise in the counties. Even those with more substantial estates had a vested interest in ensuring that the major wardships in their counties were firmly under friendly control, both for his own peace of mind and that of the members of his affinity. The most notable example of this type of preference exist in the higher peerage, as in the case of Robert de Ufford, raised to the earldom of Suffolk in 1337.⁶⁵ In July 1333, Ufford was granted the wardship of two parts of the lands of the heir of John de Saint Philbert, the estate of whom comprised at least six manors in Norfolk and Suffolk,⁶⁶ and in February of 1334, the manor of Cawston (Norfolk) came into his hands for ten

⁶³ CFR 1337-47, 417. The extent was £12. 2s. per annum. E401/397 (2 July 1349).

⁶⁴ CFR 1347-56, 256.

⁶⁵ Robert de Ufford (d. 1316) died holding numerous lands and manors in Suffolk. CIPM v, 44.

⁶⁶ In November of 1335, he received this wardship free of rent. CPR 1330-34, 365; CPR 1334-38, 176. He also purchased the marriage of the heir in July of 1334. CPR 1330-34, 559. For the estate of John de Saint Philbert, see CIPM vii, 366-67.

years at a rent of £60 per year.⁶⁷ In July 1346, Suffolk was granted the marriage of the heir of John de Bernak,⁶⁸ a wardship which was fairly important to the earl because he had also leased from the king the minority of the lands of the same, namely two parts of the manor of Hethersett and Bestthorp, and two parts of the lands in Wymondham, Buckenham, and Denton (Norfolk), rendering £120 yearly.⁶⁹ Finally, in the last grant which Suffolk was to get from the king in May 1368, Ufford was granted the wardship of the son of Constantine de Clifton which included the manor of Babbyngle and two parts of the manor of Wymondham which his wife, Margaret, had held for life.⁷⁰ Though obviously not as extensive as the grants to Bradeston, probably because Ufford had already received substantial permanent patronage from the king, nonetheless all these grants were dictated by the Ufford's previous interests and all were crucial if he wished to maintain strong lordship in the area.⁷¹

However, this geographically based wardship granting policy was not just in the interests of a new creation in terms of territorial power. Firstly, for someone as newly

⁶⁷ CCR 1334-37, 389. This was a manor which Ufford had previously held before his reversion to Costessey had taken effect.

⁶⁸ CPR 1345-48, 136. On 16 July 1350, because of debts owed by the king to Ufford, this payment was forgiven until the king's debt was paid. CPR 1348-50, 582.

⁶⁹ CPR 1345-48, 144.

⁷⁰ CPR 1367-70, 111.

⁷¹ Similarly, the aforementioned grant of the Ormond heir and his estate to John Darcy, justicar of Ireland, could not but have been dictated by his previous interests in the region. See above, pp. 76-77. Of the remaining new men not granted lands in the same county, some were in neighbouring counties, such as the grant to John Verdon of the wardship of Thomas de Burgh - which included lands in Cambridge, Verdon himself holding lands in the adjoining county of Suffolk. CIPM xiv, 246.

risen as Bradeston, though such grants were obviously an important addition to more permanent patronage, they were also a quick and convenient way to status within county society. After all, as with in-laws, nothing gave a man rank in such a setting as much as the ability to control the fate of the estates of his neighbours, even if only temporarily. It is, therefore, notable in Appendix 4 that a large portion of wardships, including parcels of estates of the titled nobility, went to the more humble of Edward's new men. Though this may in part be the result of a tendency to give less permanent grants to the lesser of his creations, nonetheless, as with Edward's use of marriage, it also had the potential to give them a more prominent role in the areas which they were developing estates.⁷²

But Edward's efforts for his new men can also be seen in the more general historical framework of the period. For, as noted previously, when Edward III came to his majority in 1330, the nobility, aside from being depleted by natural and unnatural events, was also suffering from the divisions caused by over two decades of conflict, of court versus country. From almost the start of Edward II's reign until the coup in Nottingham, members of the nobility had been forced to take either the side of the crown or the side of the opposition. Though the main cause of the last of these conflicts had perished on the chopping block in 1330, not only did the connected enmities not necessarily disappear, but new ones had the potential to rise as a result of the favour Edward now showed his peerage creations. The

⁷² See also Waugh, Lordship of England, 188.

'community of the realm', as Waugh had called it in the thirteenth century, was thus in a rather desperate state by the 1330's.⁷³

Edward's use of wardships over the next three decades helped to effect the repair of this situation. The dispersal of the estates of heirs between the different noble families had always been a way to unify the body of the nobility as a whole by giving each a stake in the other's welfare.⁷⁴ Thus, by including the 'new nobility' in this process, by giving his new peers control over the lands of the old nobility and therefore by giving the old nobility an interest in the well being of the new creations, Edward managed to bring 'old' and 'new' together in a renewed 'community of the realm'. Moreover, this held true not only of those old nobility who had managed to retain their position through the troubles of the 1320's such as the Pembrokes, the Ormonds, and to a lesser extent the Atholls,⁷⁵ but more importantly those who had ended up forfeiting their estates such as the Despensers and the Mortimers. After all, it was often Edward's new men who had major parts in the downfall of these families, especially in the case of the Mortimers, and it was with these which peace would have to be made. Thus, though in some ways forced, such a patronage policy nonetheless would have encouraged many of those on the wrong side in the previous

⁷³ Waugh, Lordship of England, 10, 208-13.

⁷⁴ Waugh, Lordship of England, 10. Indeed, such could hardly help but be the case when there was a policy of not granting wardships to blood relations as appears to have been the practice during the reign - at least with Edward's new men. See above, pp. 101-03.

⁷⁵ The earl of Atholl did, after all, forfeit for a little while during the mid 1330's. See pp. 44-45, 182.

decade to be more accommodating to the new political elite arising in the 1330's and 1340's.

To sum up, then, when Edward tried to cater his dispersal of wardships to the tastes of the new men, though lineage, mainly in connection with in-laws, was an issue, he first looked to their geographical interests in making grants. But it was not simply the increase in their landed estate which made the new men amenable to such a policy, but also their position within their respective spheres of influence. For, by being able to control the estates of their neighbours, both gentry and noble, the position of Edward's new men was enhanced both nationally and in the localities. Finally, their control of the lands of the older or more established nobility also facilitated their acceptance within the latter's ranks - or, at the very least, gained them the grudging respect due to the guardians of parts of their estates. In many ways, then, wardships were an ideal source of patronage for a king looking to endow a "new nobility".

CHAPTER FIVE Annuities

Unfortunately for Edward III, appropriate sources of landed income, either long term or temporary, were not always open at the time of endowment. Until these could be found, the king had to use other means to sustain his new creations - something which he did mainly through payments from various sources of royal revenue.¹ But annuities, though used extensively in his father's reign and before,² were, at first glance at least, far from the best means for Edward III to sustain his new men. Not only were the resulting writs and warrants for payments bound to cause a substantial increase in administrative paperwork, but, more importantly, such payments had the potential to diminish the funds available to finance Edward's ambitions abroad. This being said, if Edward wished to enable his new men to live in a manner befitting nobility at times when feudal sources were not forthcoming, annuities were often the only option.

In Edward's reign, there were basically two types of annuity, one granted by exchequer assignment and the other directly off sources of royal revenue.³ The first, usually designated by the phrase "at the exchequer", meant that an individual, granted an annuity of a specified sum, would then

¹ Usually paid in the Michaelmas and Easter terms.

² For a list of annuities given out by Edward II to his nobles, see Phillips, Aymer de Valence, 312-14. The concept of the "money fief", which had been around at least since the Conquest, can be seen as a variant of this - though it usually appears to have had military commitments clearly stated in the text of the grant. B.D. Lyon, 'The Money Fief under the English Kings', EHR lxvi (1951), 161-93

³ The process of assignment itself perhaps dates back to the twelfth century. A. Steel, 'The Distribution of Assignment in the Treasurer's Receipt Roll, Michaelmas, 1364-5', Cambridge Historical Journal ii (1927), 178.

take either the letter patent, a writ for payment, or both to the clerks at the exchequer.⁴ The wording of such grants was general, not mentioning the source of the annuity and making any arrangement last until appropriate, though often unspecified, lands and/or rents became available.⁵ Though on the odd occasion paid in cash by the clerk of the exchequer,⁶ the individual involved would more often then be assigned a revenue source (or sources) - which might or might not be the same as that for the previous annuity payment - when he appeared at the exchequer. The procedure for this seems to

⁴ Harriss, following on Guiseppi, states that "those seeking payment of an annuity, or a prest in support of one of the recognized charges of state, would be covered by their general (or dormant) warrant, while for all occasional debts and charges an occasional (or final) warrant, issued usually under the privy seal, would be required". G.L. Harriss, 'Preference at the Medieval Exchequer', BIHR xxx (1975), 17. However, in times of financial restraint, even exchequer annuities seem to have needed warrants for issue before they could be paid. For example, see E404/2/12 (4 August 1331); E404/2/11 (5 October 1333); E404/3/19 (26 March 1337). For much of what follows concerning the process of assignment, see H. Jenkinson, 'Exchequer Tallies', Archaeologia lxi, part 2 (1911), 367-80; J.F. Willard, 'The Crown and its Creditors, 1327-33', EHR xlii (1927), 12-19; A. Steel, Receipt of the Exchequer 1377-1485 (1954), xxix-xl, 1-35; G.L. Harriss, 'Fictitious Loans', ECHR, 2nd series viii:2 (1955-56), 187-99; Harriss, 'Preference', 17-40.

⁵ For example, on 3 April 1335 Walter Manny was granted "£100, to be received yearly at the exchequer until the king or his heirs shall grant the equivalent in land and rent within the realm to him and his heirs". CPR 1334-38, 90.

⁶ There are only four recognizable instances on the Issue Rolls where Edward's new men were given payment of their annuities in cash - designated by the word 'sol' in the margin of the rolls. In two cases, those of Hugh de Audley and Guy Brian, the annuities were small, £10 and £20 respectively. In the other two, the individuals involved, William de Bohun and Henry Grosmont, had been marked out for special favour by the king. For the payment to Audley, see E403/302 (23 November 1338); for Brian, E403/305 (27 May 1340); for Bohun and Grosmont, E403/302 (23 December 1338). For the relationship between cash payment and assignment on the issue and receipt rolls, see Willard, 'The Crown and its Creditors', 16-19. A. Steel, 'The Practice of Assignment in the Later Fourteenth Century', EHR xliii (1928), 172-80; A. Steel, 'The Distribution of Assignment', 178-85.

have entailed an exchequer clerk making a record of the payment on the Issue Rolls of the date, county, payee, the nature of the payment, the term for which it was being paid, the order by which it was done, and the amount of the payment. On a corresponding day in the receipt rolls, or a date soon thereafter, an entry was recorded whereby the source of the payment was specified, along with the amount,⁷ and usually a combination of a writ and tally - or receipt in the form of a notched wooden stick which was broken as a chirograph was torn - were made.⁸ The individual involved would then take the writ and tally - with the name of the source and the amount due inscribed on it - to the officer in charge of the revenue source. If the payment was made, the individual would then hand over the writ and/or tally as a receipt to the officer, who would in turn produce it at the upper exchequer when it came time to audit the accounts.⁹

These "at the exchequer" payments were the basis for many annuities. However, payment was dependent on a number of

⁷ Beginning in the 1330's there began to appear notes in the marginalia of the receipt rolls as to whether a source of revenue had been assigned, being denoted by a "pro x" or a variation thereof, though this by no means became common until the late 1340's. Steel, Receipt of the Exchequer, xxx-xxxi; Steel, 'Distribution of Assignment', 178. For a useful guide to the different types of marginalia denoting assignment, see A. Steel, 'The Marginalia of the Treasurer's Receipt Rolls', BIHR vii-viii (1929-30).

⁸ It should be noted, however, that there were a number of variations on this procedure. See Willard, 'The Crown and its Creditors', 18-19. Though I have noted down the writs for payment under the Great Seal as recorded in the Close Rolls, those under the exchequer seal in the Memoranda Rolls I have had to omit, in part due to time constraints, but also because my interest lies, after the original grant, not so much in the orders for payment - which for annuities should be fairly regular - but whether the payments were actually made - which show up in the Issue and Receipt Rolls. For the different types of writ, see *Ibid.*, 13.

⁹ For when a tally was not honoured, see below, pp. 127-28.

factors - most notably, what accounts happened to be outstanding at a particular time, the amount of the annuity, the degree of influence an individual had at the exchequer, and, in the end, the amount of royal favour an annuitant possessed.¹⁰ As a result, such annuities were paid from a miscellany of sources, often whatever accounts happened to be outstanding on a certain day. An early example of an exchequer annuity is one to Hugh de Audley on becoming earl of Gloucester in 1337. Originally granted £100 per annum in March of 1337 until lands or rents came in, in September of that year Audley was granted the manors of Kirkby upon Ashfield (Nottinghamshire) and Eckington (Derbyshire) in fulfilment of £90 of this grant.¹¹ The remaining £10 per annum continued to come from the exchequer until Michaelmas 1344 when it appears to have stopped.¹² Between these dates, there are at least three different sources of payment.¹³ For the first term of the annuity, the Michaelmas term of 1337, payment was made by the collectors of the lay fifteenth and tenth in the county of Gloucester, the amount at that time still being the full £50 term payment.¹⁴ In Michaelmas 1338, after the manors had been granted, the payment was one of the rare instances of cash fulfilment of an annuity at the

¹⁰ See Harriss, 'Preference at the Mediaeval Exchequer', 17-40.

¹¹ CPR 1334-38, 414-15, 522. See also above, p. 46.

¹² For all references for annuities and their payments, see Appendix 5b.

¹³ If not more - it is almost impossible to identify assignments made on the Receipt Roll when there is no marginalia, and especially when the sum involved is a common one - such as £10.

¹⁴ E403/298 (24 October 1337). There should be a corresponding entry on the receipt rolls for these payments, though at this time the system of marginalia had yet to become consistent.

exchequer, being noted in the margin of the Issue Roll by the word 'sol'.¹⁵ Another payment of the annuity in June of 1342 was from the 100s fine paid by one John le Marschal.¹⁶ An even earlier example of the miscellanea of sources used to fulfil these obligations was an annuity to Henry of Grosmont, the son of Henry of Lancaster.¹⁷ Fowler notes that in 1322, Henry only had control of the lordships of Beaufort and Monmouth, granted to him by his father.¹⁸ This, along with the fact that his father had to pay his expenses for 1331-32,¹⁹ led the king to grant Henry a 500 mark annuity in March of 1332 in order to allow him to sustain himself.²⁰ Though this annuity only continued for a year and a half, after which he was given the wardship of the castle and lands of Abergavenny, payment was again made from at least three different sources - including fines,²¹ a payment from a 10th and 15th,²² and part of a farm.²³

However, an example from the height of the reign - namely a 200 mark annuity granted to Michael Poynings on 23 March 1347 -²⁴ is perhaps more illustrative of the process of exchequer assignment.²⁵ This started off being paid from the

¹⁵ E403/302 (23 November 1338). This type of marginalia on the Issue Rolls had ceased by the end of the decade. W.M. Ormrod, 'The Protecolla Rolls and English Government Finance, 1353-1364', *EHR* cii (1987), 623.

¹⁶ E403/326 (3 June 1342); E401/368 (4 June 1342).

¹⁷ See Appendix 5b.

¹⁸ Fowler, *King's Lieutenant*, 26.

¹⁹ Fowler, *King's Lieutenant*, 28.

²⁰ *CPR* 1330-34, 265.

²¹ E403/265 (17 December 1332); E401/308 (17 December 1332)

²² E403/267 (16 July 1333); E401/311 (16 July 1333)

²³ E403/271 (1 March 1334). As marginalia has yet to become the norm in this period, the other sources for this annuity, as with the Gloucester annuity, are difficult to identify.

²⁴ *CPR* 1345-48, 268.

²⁵ See Appendix 5b.

lay fifteenth and tenths from the county of Sussex and continued to be paid that way until February 1350 when the grant from parliament ran out. He was paid by his prest - that is, an advance - for part of the next term, and the term after that, but then no more payments were made until Easter of 1352, when funds from another fifteenth and tenth granted that year were used. Payment over the next ten years was somewhat erratic, sometimes nothing appearing to have been paid for three terms running, and then a series of arrears being recorded. Nonetheless, through a variety of sources - the Chichester customs, fines for alien priories, prests, tenths and fifteenths, clerical tenths, and farms of bailiwicks - the exchequer clerks managed to fulfil a not inconsiderable amount of the royal financial obligations to Poynings.

Such a variety of sources could stabilize, however, if the situation was favourable to both the king and the annuitant. Such appears to have been the case with a £40 annuity granted to Guy de Brian. Granted around 1340,²⁶ this started off being paid from the castle of Saint Briavel and the Forest of Dean, of which Brian had earlier been granted the custodianship.²⁷ Brian was further granted another £40 annuity on 26 August 1346, "to support the order of

²⁶ The earliest mention I have found for this annuity is in the Issue Rolls: E403/309 (27 May 1340). For list of payments, see Appendix 5b.

²⁷ On 17 October 1335, Brian had been granted the keeping of the castle and forest "with the issues thereof from Michaelmas last, he rendering and receiving as much as Robert de Sapy rendered and received". CFR 1327-37, 461. According to Harriss, "To secure remittance of an official debt in discharge of a personal claim . . . was one of the commonest ways of obtaining one's dues". Harriss, 'Preference at the Medieval Exchequer', 26-27.

knighthood which he has taken from the king, and for his fee for his stay with him".²⁸ Though this was sometimes paid from other sources, such as clerical tenths, the farm of Somerset and Dorset, fifteenths and tenths, customs, alien priories, debts and revenues of bishop's temporalities, for most of the life of the annuity, which continued for the rest of the reign,²⁹ payment was made from what he owed yearly for the castle of Saint Briavel and the Forest of Dean. This, then, made receiving payment of the annuity a far less complicated task for Brian than had the sources continued to be a miscellany of whatever accounts happened to be due on the day he, or one of his servants, came in to obtain payment.

Exchequer annuities were one way for the king to fulfil his obligations to his new creations. There was, however, another way - by payments assigned direct off a fixed source. This was what Brian's annuity noted above had gradually turned into, but one of the advantages of this second type of grant was that the source was decided on from the beginning. Usually identified in the letters patent,³⁰ grants direct from previously designated sources would almost always have royal orders going out directly to the officers in charge of the annuity, thereby by-passing the process of exchequer

²⁸ CPR 1345-48, 474.

²⁹ Though £60 of this was later transferred to a direct payment off the farm of the Saint Briavel and Dean - in essence a remission of rent. E403/356 (3 June 1351).

³⁰ Though sometimes it would simply originally be noted that the annuity was not to be taken from the treasury. For example, see the 100 mark annuity to William Aldeburgh in early 1356. CPR 1354-58, 349. Two months later it was decided that the money was to come from the Boston customs in payments made twice a year. CPR 1354-58, 354.

assignment, to ensure payment.³¹ For example, in the case of William de Aldeburgh, though not a particularly favoured new creation, orders went out for the payment of his 100 mark annuity with a fair degree of regularity after it was first granted.³² Similarly, upon John de Beauchamp's exchange of an annuity out of the alien priory of Hayling to that from the London customs,³³ orders went out to the collector of the custom of wool hides and wood-fells in the port of London to pay Beauchamp the amount due.³⁴ And, though warrants for issue may at times be seen as serving the same purpose for exchequer annuity payments,³⁵ it is notable that, at least in the case of Edward's new creations, not only were orders concerning source based annuities mandatory,³⁶ but orders for

³¹ For instance, in the case of annuities from customs, "the exchequer issued a general instruction to the collectors that the annuity was to be paid to such a person, but the person concerned also had to produce a second writ, showing that payment was actually due for that particular term, or half year". M.H. Mills, 'The Collectors of Customs', in *EGW*, ii, 194; see also Ormrod, 'Protecolla Rolls', 624-25. This second writ, usually enroled on the Close Rolls, appears to have come on the king's authority rather than the exchequer's. As a result of this system, payments of this type of annuity never show up on the Issue and Receipt Rolls. For example, see William Aldeburgh's annuity. *CCR* 1354-60, 261, 378; see also W.M. Ormrod, 'The English Crown and the Customs, 1349-63', *EcHR*, 2nd ser. xl (1987), 35. The only time the exchequer came into the picture, aside from when the standing order was originally given, was when it came time to audit the accounts of the various sources of royal revenue - as recorded in the Pipe Rolls (E372), Chancellors Rolls (E352) and Customs Account (E356).

³² For example, *CCR* 1354-60, 261, 378, 443, 471; *CCR* 1360-64, 29. Though it later went into arrears. See *CCR* 1364-68, 250; for payments see E122/193/18; checked against E356/8.

³³ *CPR* 1345-48, 169.

³⁴ *CCR* 1346-49, 302, 470, 564. These later started going to Walter de Chiriton and his associates when they gained control over all the customs and subsidies in the English ports. See *CCR* 1349-54, 117, 160, 173.

³⁵ For example, warrants for issue for the payment of annuities to Manny. E404/4/22; E404/4/28; E404/7/48; E404/8/51; E404/9/57.

their payment were enroled in the Close Rolls - thus denoting not only administrative concern but also the king's personal interest.³⁷

The main sources of previously designated patronage were threefold: farms of manors, hundreds, towns, and counties; customs of the ports of the realm; and issues from confiscated alien religious lands. Of the different sources of payment, indeed, the grant of the farms paid for counties, manors, hundreds and other lands held of the king were quite common.³⁸ Some new men were given the farms paid by those holding manors under royal control, as when in 1331 William Bohun was granted the £90 farm paid by the abbot of Kirkstall for the manor of Collingham (Yorkshire), in the king's hands by reason of his custody of John, heir of Edmund, late earl of Kent, to hold until the minority of the heir or until provision be made for him.³⁹ Others were given the farm of town issues. On 18 September 1330, Thomas Bradeston was granted farms of £65 and 100 marks out of the farm of the town of Gloucester.⁴⁰ In a late grant of an annuity, in October of 1376, Roger de Beauchamp was granted for life 100 mark annuity "to be taken by his own hands" out of the farm of £85 due from the castle and town of Devizes (Wiltshire)

³⁶ Especially in connection with the customs. See above, p. 119 footnote 31.

³⁷ For a discussion of the contents of the Close Rolls, see G.R. Elton, England 1200-1640 (1969), 39-40.

³⁸ According to Jewell, a farm was "a fixed amount of produce or cash rent required from an area" - though by this time it was usually the latter. Jewell, English Local Administration, 97-98.

³⁹ CPR 1330-34, 193.

⁴⁰ Though these were originally granted by Isabella during the minority of Edward III, the fact that Edward later confirmed them was an act of patronage in itself. CPR 1327-37, 238; CPR 1330-34, 6.

which he held for the life of the king's grant.⁴¹ But perhaps the largest grant of this type was connected with one of Edward's new earls. William Clinton was granted 1000 marks of land in 1337 upon becoming earl of Huntingdon.⁴² Clinton was immediately given the manor of Kirton (Lincolnshire) worth 500 marks per annum. However, as no other appropriate land appears to have been available, the other 500 marks was to be made up of the expectancies of the manors of Holme and Glatton, as well as the site of the castle of Huntingdon, all in Huntingdonshire and held for life by Queen Isabella and the Countess of Pembroke respectively.⁴³ Until the rest of the land could come in, however, Clinton had to be given other income to help him sustain his new rank. As a consequence of this, he was granted £100. 10s. yearly of the farm and issues of the county of Kent, and the balance of the £232. 16s. 8d., to wit: £33. 6s. 8d. of the farms and issues of the counties of Huntingdon and Cambridgeshire; £59. 10s. of the farms and issues of the county of Kent; £80 of the farms of the towns of Winchelsea and Rye, the manor of Iham (Sussex) and connected properties; £60 of the farm of the town of Sandwich; and £10 of the farm of the king's seven hundreds in the county of Kent.⁴⁴

⁴¹ CPR 1375-77, 352. Notably in this case, however, there was no mention of this simply being a provision until lands and rents came in, and might be more of a grant in aid of his office as chamberlain.

⁴² CPR 1334-38, 415.

⁴³ See pp. 57.

⁴⁴ It must be noted, however, that having payments from the farm were not the same as holding the actual farm of county, etc. When one had the latter, one simply paid the king a set amount (ie. the farm) for the area under his control, and was often then, in fact, free to derive any further profit he could from it - something which could cause a great deal of

Customs, while commonly used for the payment of exchequer annuities,⁴⁵ were also another direct source for annuities. Annuities from such a source could be relatively small, as when Thomas Bradeston was granted 100 marks per annum from "the issues of the customs and subsidies of wool, hides and wool fells in the port of London", which he had been granted in replacement of the life grant of the bailiwick of the prévôté of l'Entre-deux Mers in the duchy of Aquitaine.⁴⁶ However, customs seem to have been mainly useful for larger annuities. William Bohun, created earl of Northampton in March of 1337, in order to sustain this rank was given £1000 in land, made up of a number of expectancies the worth of which totalled £739. 16s. 11 1/4d., the remainder to be paid at the exchequer.⁴⁷ Until these expectancies came in, however, Bohun was to be paid £400 from the customs of the port of London, £150 from the port of Boston, £150 from the port of Kingston upon Hull, as well as £200 from the farm of the city of London, and £100 from the sheriff of Essex.⁴⁸ Similarly, in 1337, Henry de Grosmont, upon becoming earl of Derby, was granted 1000 marks per annum out of the royal customs, namely 400 marks out of the customs at the city of London, 300 marks from the port of Boston and 300 marks from the port of Kingston upon Hull.⁴⁹ This grant

hardship and complaint. Jewell, English Local Administration, 97-99.

⁴⁵ See Appendix 5b.

⁴⁶ CPR 1340-43, 82; CPR 1354-58, 54.

⁴⁷ See CCharR 1327-41, 401, 484-85.

⁴⁸ CPR 1334-38, 416-17.

⁴⁹ CPR 1334-38, 400. Later in the same year, the part of the grant giving Derby 400 marks of the customs of the Port of London was changed to the same amount from the Petty Customs of the City of London. CPR 1338-40, 319.

was, however, unlike the grants to the other 1337 creations, meant only to tide Derby over until he came into his inheritance.

The war with France provided the final major source for annuities - namely, the income from confiscated alien religious lands.⁵⁰ Several of Edward's new creations were given some form of annuity from this source. A good example is that of Thomas de Bradeston. On 16 October 1339, Edward III granted to Thomas Bradeston, "for his better support in the estate of banneret", an annuity of 500 marks at the exchequer until appropriate lands or rents came in.⁵¹ With no evidence of any type of payment having been made in the interim,⁵² on April 26 of the next year, the source of this annuity was changed to the

500 marks paid by the proctor of the abbot of Fecamp for the custody of the lands of the abbot in England lately taken into the king's hands with the other lands of aliens of the power of France, to hold for such time as the lands are in the king's hands or other provision be made for him⁵³

with the proviso later added that "if any part of the lands shall have been granted to others, he shall receive such part of the 500 marks as shall be wanting at the exchequer".⁵⁴ On

⁵⁰ For a discussion of alien priories, see above, pp. 47-49.

⁵¹ CPR 1338-40, 395. Six months later, on 4 April 1340, some of the lands connected with this grant were given a name when he was granted the reversion of the castle and manor of Llanfair and the land and lordship of Builth in South Wales, the lifeholder of which was Alice, countess of Lincoln. CPR 1338-40, 448.

⁵² See E403/307 passim.

⁵³ CPR 1338-40, 471. See also E101/212/1/14 (18 June 1340): hanaper order for the delivery of a charter to this effect. First order for payment on 3 September 1340. CCR 1339-41, 511-12.

⁵⁴ CPR 1340-43, 28. On at least three occasions Thomas had to be partially paid from the Exchequer, when he was assigned

18 August 1344, the keeping of some of the abbey's lands in Sussex were granted to Eleanor de Beaumont, 'the king's kinswomen', and Richard de Melbourn, parson of the church of Edelesburgh.⁵⁵ In their stead, on the next day Bradeston was granted the farm of the prior of Deerhurst (£110) and Newent (£130) (Gloucestershire).⁵⁶ Further modifications of the grant came in July of the same year, by way of a petition of Bradeston's, that because 84 marks of the said sum due to him from the abbot's manors of Cheltenham and Slaughter were in arrears, he might have the custody of those manors to that value, to which the king agreed.⁵⁷ Finally, on 20 February 1349, the king gave the keeping of all the abbey's lands in England back to the proctor, and Bradeston appears to have been paid by this individual from this point on.⁵⁸

In another example, on 13 January 1350, Brian was granted, "for many services rendered to the king for a long time, and for his good behaviour now in the last conflict between the king and his enemies of France at Calais in bearing the king's standard against them prudently and keeping it uplifted strenuously and powerfully", an annuity of 200 marks at the exchequer for life until he gained equal provision in lands and rents.⁵⁹ On October 22 of the same

his own payments for the castle of Gloucester and the temporalities of the archbishop of York. E403/326 (6 May 1342), E401/368 (6 May 1342); E403/327 (5 November 1342), E401/370 (5 November 1342); E403/330 (13 February 1344).

⁵⁵ CFR 1337-47, 386.

⁵⁶ Bradeston was to answer for the £3. 12s. 9d. by which farms exceeded the amount owed to him - though again, if these sources were found wanting, he would be paid at the exchequer. CFR 1337-47, 386-87. The keeping of Deerhurst was held by Queen Isabella. CCR 1343-46, 535.

⁵⁷ CPR 1343-45, 517, 553.

⁵⁸ CCR 1349-54, 9-10; CPR 1348-50, 273.

⁵⁹ CPR 1348-50, 444; Appendix 5b.

year, letters were then granted of the 200 marks out of the farms of the alien priories of Otterton and Newnton Longville.⁶⁰ In July of 1354, probably as a result of the on-going peace negotiations between England and France, Brian was further granted, for "security of payment" of this annuity, that if the priories were to be removed from the king's control for any reason, he would get for life the annuity from the issues of the counties of Somerset and Dorset (150 marks) and Gloucestershire (50 marks).⁶¹ After the peace of Calais in 1360, these annuities indeed had to be given up, and, in the case of Brian, he was granted the amount out of the said county issues.⁶² John Beauchamp also received annuities from alien religious houses, as did Grey,⁶³ Clinton,⁶⁴ and Lancaster.⁶⁵ All of these lapsed when peace was restored as well, but again if the new man affected was favoured enough, Edward III did not hesitate to make other arrangements for payment of annuities.⁶⁶

⁶⁰ CPR 1348-50, 444. First order for payment for both priors. CCR 1349-51, 257. For later evidence of payment, see an order for payment of £23. 6s. 8d. from Newton Longeville on 26 April 1351. E106/9/27/1. On 26 February 1352, Otterton was regranted to Brian, William de Alba Marlia and John Gogh and later, on 28 April 1352, to Brian and brother Thomas Sedille, monk and proctor of the abbey of Mont St. Michel. CFR 1347-56, 322-23, 326.

⁶¹ CPR 1354-58, 100.

⁶² CPR 1358-61, 564.

⁶³ CPR 1345-48, 246; CCR 1346-49, 182.

⁶⁴ CFR 1347-56, 208.

⁶⁵ CFR 1337-47, 281. This was taken back by the king on September 12 of the following year, presumably as a result of the earl's detention at Malines as a surety for the king's debts. CFR 1337-47, 298-99, 230-31.

⁶⁶ For example CPR 1358-61, 564.

Aside from a few other miscellaneous items such as a grant of 1000 marks yearly out of the coinage of tin in Cornwall to William Montagu,⁶⁷ or a £100 grant from the hanaper for Robert de Burghcher,⁶⁸ these were the main source based annuities used for Edward's new creations. But to make either variety of arrangement for his new creations was one thing, for them to be carried through was very much another. Indeed, assignments made at the exchequer were especially notorious on this account. Not only were there any number of standing charges, not to mention occasional debts, which had to be met for a given term, but this was also, of course, where the wardrobe debentures were to be honoured for the payment of troops and the purchase of supplies.⁶⁹ Unsurprisingly, then, it often became a competition to see who could get the instalments of their annuities paid - usually entailing a mixture of knowledge of the exchequer administration, bribery, and royal influence.⁷⁰

Somewhat surprising, then, was the fact that Edward's new creations did not have to go to such extremes to obtain

⁶⁷ CPR 1334-38, 426-27. Salzman notes a 1000 mark annuity off the coinage as being in payment of a 5000 mark royal debt, though it is unclear if this was the same annuity - from the Patent Roll entry, at least, it is not. See L.F. Salzman, 'Mines and Stannaries', in EGW, iii, 99.

⁶⁸ At one point lord chancellor, Burghcher was made this grant on 20 December 1340 for good service and as compensation for leaving the earl of Gloucester's service until lands or rents could be provided for him. CCR 1341-43, 46.

⁶⁹ See Steel, 'Some Aspects of English Finance', 303-05; Waugh, Edward III, 177.

⁷⁰ See Harriss, 'Preference at the Medieval Exchequer', 17-40. And, if worse came to worse, which it sometimes did, an annuitant would have to go to a tally discounter. There does not appear to have been any necessity for this for Edward's new men - though it is often difficult to identify cases of tally discounting on the receipt rolls. See Steel, Receipt of the Exchequer, xxxv-xxxvi.

payment on their exchequer annuities. Though few such annuities can be said to have been paid in full,⁷¹ there is very little evidence that they were not paid most of the time - and usually, if not on time, then within a few terms of the payment date.⁷² Moreover, though it is dangerous to argue from a lack of evidence, one would expect that, had it actually been considered a serious problem in the odd case when exchequer annuities were not recorded to have been paid for long periods of time, one would assume that some form of evidence of the annuitant's attempts to get it paid would show up in the records - either in the form of petitions,⁷³ writs, or fictitious loans.⁷⁴ Indeed, fictitious loans are

⁷¹ See Appendix 5c. At least going from the main sources of the Issue and Receipt Rolls. However, it is also very difficult to gauge the full extent of such payments made by the king, as the Issue Rolls "by no means account for the whole of the king's expenditure". See A. Steel, 'Some Aspects of Fourteenth Century Finance', *History* xii (1928), 301-02.

⁷² It is, unfortunately, not practical to do a year by year analysis of payment rates due not only to the recording of undesignated arrears, but also because it is often very difficult to know how much of an annuity was to be paid for a year in which land was granted in part or full fulfilment of a grant. Nonetheless, going from the illustrative examples given in Appendix 5b, it appears, unsurprisingly, that payment rates often seem to have been intermittent during periods of financial stress, especially in the 1340's. See Appendix 5b. There is also a problem in that, for some years, though luckily not in succession, the Treasurer's Receipt Roll has not survived. This means that one has to rely on the chamberlains' rolls, on which marginalia, and therefore evidence of assignment, is somewhat lacking. See Steel, 'The Practice of Assignment', 177-78.

⁷³ Edward was always being harassed by petitioners to get their suit heard, and yet little has survived concerning the nonpayment of annuities to his new creations. Concerning this harassment, see Ormrod, *Edward III*, 57-58.

⁷⁴ Only one case of chronic nonpayment of an annuity seems to exist. On 12 March 1338, Manny was granted a second £100 annuity at the exchequer, the first one having been granted in 1335 and just recently fulfilled. There seems to have been no effort made to pay this until 1340, when three small payments are noted as being made. After that, no more mentions of payment of any type were made until 1360 when it is noted as being £2100 in arrears. After this, it appears to

perhaps the best indicator of problems with payment.⁷⁵ Yet in only two instances in payments made to exchequer annuitants can tallies be definitely shown not to have been honoured - and even then, when the sources had been changed, they were honoured within the year.⁷⁶

Source based annuities, on the other hand, seem to have been slightly less reliable when it came to payment - though here it is very difficult to decide how much again was due to lack of payment, and how much to weaknesses in the records.⁷⁷ They do, however, have a lower overall rate of payment,⁷⁸ and there are also more obvious instances when source based annuities were not paid for a number of terms running than exchequer assigned ones - such as William Clinton's £50 annuity from the farm of the town of Sandwich, which has no

have been paid regularly until near the time of Manny's death. CCR 1360-64, 81. This does not include three annuities on which payment stopped after a few terms, or which were only paid once or twice, as these seem to have been effectively cancelled. See Appendix 5a and 5c.

⁷⁵ See Harriss, 'Fictitious Loans', 187-99. Though there is not much evidence for the first part of the reign due to a lack of annotations of the Receipt Roll. See above p. 114 footnote 7.

⁷⁶ See Appendix 5b for the £200 annuity for Thomas Ughtred and the 100 mark annuity for Thomas Musgrave. The latter was also in a period when mass nonpayment of annuities was not uncommon. See Given-Wilson, Royal Household, 131-32. For a discussion of 'fictitious loans' on the receipt rolls, see G.L. Harriss, 'Fictitious Loans', EcHR, 2nd series 8:2 (1955-56), 187-99.

⁷⁷ There is especially some question to the accuracy of customs records, though this is probably more to do with records concerning exports. See S.H. Rigby, 'The Customs Administration at Boston in the Reign of Richard II', BIHR lviii (1985), 13. Also, the fact that the customs was not under the control of the exchequer in the period 1344-51 may also explain some of the missing payments on the Pipe Rolls. Concerning more general state in the customs service at this time, see R.L. Baker, The English Customs Service: A Study of Medieval Administration (1961), 33-51; Ormrod, 'The English Crown and the Customs', 27-39.

⁷⁸ See Appendix 5c.

recorded payments from the Michaelmas term of 1339 until his death in 1354 when arrears, though only a small amount of the total amount owing, were paid.⁷⁹ Similarly, some of the annuity payments from alien priories tend to be irregularly paid, though again, it is difficult to know if the record of these payments simply did not make it on to the Pipe Roll.⁸⁰

Nonetheless, going from the surviving evidence, source based annuities had a lower payment rate than exchequer annuities. In many ways, this is understandable. After all, since these payments were based on only one source, if that source failed, whether because of lack of funds, or for other reasons, the annuitant could be out of luck when it came to obtaining payment. For example, when the king wanted to pay off some of his debts to the Bardi in 1331, all the customs revenues of the port of London were diverted to this end - regardless of what outstanding assignments existed.⁸¹ Indeed, though payments of arrears were made,⁸² there does not appear

⁷⁹ E372/186/14/10b; E372/199/35/10b. For percentage of payment, see Appendix 5c. There is, also, more evidence of petitioning to get payments in arrears fulfilled - as with the case of William Aldeburgh's 100 mark annuity from customs and Thomas de Bradeston's 500 mark annuity off alien priories. CCR 1364-68, 250; and above, p. 124.

⁸⁰ For example, it will be noted that in the table for Guy de Brian's 200 mark annuity granted in the early 1350's, part of the table for the sum from Newnton Longville has had to be made up from the priory's records of payments out (E106/9/27) as there are no corresponding payments listed on the Pipe rolls. See Appendix 5b.

⁸¹ Only when an assignee(s) - in this case John de Hanonia, the count of Juliers, John de Berners, William Chaumberleyn, and Gerard de Potes - was specifically singled out for payment in the text of the order could he be relatively sure of fulfilment of his annuity - at least for the term in question. CCR 1330-33, 108. This practice, especially common as a result of the financial demands of the war, was noted by Steel, 'Some Aspects of English Finance', 304.

⁸² See the example of William Aldeburgh noted above, pp. 119 footnote 32.

to have been a developed reserve system existing as there was with exchequer annuities. Add this to the fact that source based annuities, because of their often considerable geographical distance from the machinery of central government, were less well regulated than exchequer annuities and the former may be viewed as being the somewhat less secure of the two varieties of assignment.

At first glance, then, it might appear somewhat odd that, for the most part, Edward's new creations appear to have a preference for source based annuities.⁸³ Part of this may have been to do with the more general disrepute of the exchequer tally,⁸⁴ and perhaps also suspicions towards any regular financial obligation without a fixed source. Part also, in terms of the larger annuities, was probably that it would have been awkward to arrange collection of payment of exchequer assignments - especially if it had to be made up of a number of relatively small outstanding accounts.⁸⁵ More, however, may be connected with the stability and geographical convenience of the source based annuity. After all, if an annuitant knew each time where a payment was coming from, it would be much easier to obtain than if one had to go chasing around the kingdom in order to get various tallies

⁸³ For example, see Stryvelyn's request that his 200 mark exchequer annuity be changed to 200 marks from the issues of the customs of Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Hartlepool. CCR 1338-40, 335. See also Ufford's petition later in this paragraph. For the link between an annuitant's petitions and the form a grant took, see p. 204 footnote 2.

⁸⁴ On the generally bad reputation of the exchequer tally, see Steel, Receipt of the Exchequer, xxxiv-xxxv.

⁸⁵ It is notable that only one annuity which continued to be paid at the exchequer was over 200 marks. See Appendix 5a.

honoured.⁸⁶ Indeed, for the longer terms and larger sums, source based annuities, when available, seemed to be the more popular and the more practical way of getting payments for annuities. In the case of Reginald Cobham, payment direct from the sheriff of Surrey and Sussex was well suited to the annuitant. Cobham, being of a major Surrey family, and a large land holder there in his own right, was much in evidence in the workings of the county administrative machinery and therefore well able to make sure that such an annuity was paid.⁸⁷ But perhaps the clearest evidence that direct payment by this method, rather than through the exchequer, was the more preferred of the two ways was the fact that the majority of the grants to the new earls, containing the most favoured of Edward's 'new men', were made up of source based annuities. Of the six individuals made peers in 1337, four of them - Clinton, Montagu, Bohun and

⁸⁶ On the geographical problems connected with exchequer assignment, see Willard, 'The Crown and its Creditors', 12-14. But the weakness of exchequer based annuities should not be pushed too far in this respect. There were a number of cases of assignments for exchequer annuities being 'tailored' to be within a new man's area of interest. For example, Thomas Ughtred, a northern knight, was granted a 200 mark annuity in March of 1347. As a result, Ughtred was assigned by the exchequer, among other sources, some of the clerical tenth of Yorkshire, the fifteenth and tenth, issues from the Chichester, Hull and Newcastle Customs, as well as sheriff's issues for the area. These sources of assignment, then, were all well within his sphere of influence, giving him considerable sway over the officers in charge of the sources - and indeed, from Appendix 5b, he seems to have been relatively successful in his pursuit of payment. Similar stories can be told for Thomas Musgrave's and Henry le Scrope's annuities. For Ughtred's annuity, see CPR 1358-61, 430; E403/340 (19 November 1347); for Musgrave's, see CPR 1370-74, 23; and Appendix 5b.

⁸⁷ Indeed, Cobham's standing in the county ensured that he had one of the higher overall payment rates. See Appendix 5c. See Harriss, 'Preference at the Medieval Exchequer', 24-25. For Cobham, see above, pp. 15-16.

Grosmont - were given payments of this sort,⁸⁸ while of the two remaining, Audley received his land grant fairly quickly and therefore there was no reason to make long term provision for an annuity source,⁸⁹ and Robert Ufford petitioned, after a year of apparent nonpayment at the exchequer,⁹⁰ to have his converted to payments from the first farms and issues of the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk until the reversion promised him of the manor of Benhall came in.⁹¹

Edward III, then, had a mixture of factors to take into consideration when distributing annuities. Usually, it seems the different types of assignment were used as follows. Exchequer assignment was used in one of two ways. Firstly, it was simply as a way to fund a new creation until appropriate sources materialized. For example, in order to uphold the rank of banneret, Michael de Poynings was given a 200 mark life annuity at the exchequer until other provisions could be made.⁹² In another case, the exchequer annuity was replaced

⁸⁸ CPR 1334-38, 400, 409, 410, 415-17, 427.

⁸⁹ See CPR 1334-38, 522

⁹⁰ See Appendix 5b.

⁹¹ CPR 1338-40, 265-66; Appendix 5b. The fact that, at least in the case of customs revenues, "Assignments . . . [were] the security most often accorded to . . . merchants for repayment of loans", seems to back up the general perception of the value of source based assignments - though, it should be obvious by now that Professor Postan was overstating the case when he suggested that "most assignments were merely drafts upon the customs". E. Russell, 'The Societies of the Bardi and the Peruzzi and their Dealings with Edward III, 1327-45', in G. Unwin, ed., Finance and Trade under Edward III (1918), 104; Steel, Receipt of the Exchequer, xiii. Notably, according to Fryde, the assignments on which these annuities were founded were at least in part based on the expectation "of the increased revenues from the higher, wartime rates of duties. . . Only the success of the English Wool Company could give reality to these promises". E.B. Fryde, William de la Pole: Merchant and King's Banker (1988), 62.

⁹² CPR 1345-48, 268.

by a "direct source" annuity which in turn was latter replaced by lands. On 8 June 1335, Reginald de Cobham was given a 100 mark annuity, again until he received lands and rents for life.⁹³ Later changed to a 400 mark grant in March 1337,⁹⁴ this was partly filled by a life grant of the manor of Chippenham (Wiltshire), worth £64 yearly,⁹⁵ and of the farm of Great Yarmouth (£55).⁹⁶ However, to cover the rest of the grant, which was still outstanding, on 4 September 1338, Cobham's annuity payments were converted from being paid at the exchequer to being paid from the issues of the counties of Surrey and Sussex until the lands came in.⁹⁷ Indeed, for lack of any evidence to the contrary, it seems that a new man had an interest in getting away from the process of exchequer assignment and, in response to this preference, Edward often tried to move his creations from payments at the exchequer to more direct exploitation of royal revenue as soon as possible.⁹⁸ For instance, on 13 January 1350, Guy Brian was granted a 200 mark life annuity until the king could find him appropriate lands and rents.⁹⁹ However, by October 22 of the same year, the source of this had been changed to the same amount out of the farms of the alien priories of Otterton and Newnton Longville. In six other cases, a similar process took place while in no instance was a source based annuity permanently changed to an exchequer annuity.¹⁰⁰

⁹³ CPR 1334-38, 117.

⁹⁴ CPR 1334-38, 346.

⁹⁵ CPR 1334-38, 401.

⁹⁶ CPR 1338-40, 105-06.

⁹⁷ CPR 1338-40, 152.

⁹⁸ As indicated by the overwhelming predominance of source based annuities. See Appendix 5c.

⁹⁹ CPR 1348-50, 444.

¹⁰⁰ See Appendix 5a.

Secondly, exchequer annuities could be used as a reserve mechanism if lands and rents granted out were later lost or if other sources were found in some way wanting. In a case mentioned above of a 500 mark annuity granted to Bradeston, to be held originally at the exchequer, then from a farm paid by the proctor of the alien abbot of Fecamp for his lands in England,¹⁰¹ the proviso was added that "if any part of the lands shall have been granted to others, he shall receive such part of the 500 marks as shall be wanting at the exchequer".¹⁰² In the case of William Bohun's 1337 earldom grant, when payment was not forthcoming from the customs, the king ordered it to be paid out of the revenues of the exchequer.¹⁰³

Source based annuities, on the other hand, seem to have had only one major function, to run as a long term substitute until sufficient lands and rents came in. It is unsurprising, then, that most of the major annuities of the reign, including the 1337 earls, were composed, at least in part, of such sources. And, considering that they resulted from a direct order from the government on a set revenue, the fact that not only did an annuitant avoid having to compete at the exchequer to obtain worthwhile sources,¹⁰⁴ but that he would

¹⁰¹ CPR 1338-40, 471.

¹⁰² CPR 1340-43, 28.

¹⁰³ When this was first granted in 1337, there was a freeze on wool exports which drastically cut the revenue from the customs of the city of London. Therefore, the king ordered that if such revenue did not amount to Bohun's £400, that the latter should be given the deficit from the exchequer. See CCR 1337-39, 49. For the payments, see E403/302 (6 November and 12 December 1338)

¹⁰⁴ Though both types of annuitant would have presumably had to compete at the actual office of the source.

not have to go far and wide to get his tallies honoured,¹⁰⁵ made these in many ways the more preferred, and as a result the more well used, of the two types of assignment - especially for an annuity expected to run any length of time.¹⁰⁶

But it would be wrong, at least from the perspective of the grantee, to paint one type of annuity as being worth more or less than the other. Rather, exchequer annuities, as somewhat more adaptable and dependable, were used as starting and reserve sources, just as source based ones were granted for longer terms because of their convenience and long term stability. It must be emphasized, however, that the success of either type of annuity was heavily dependent on royal goodwill.¹⁰⁷ With a lack of this, exchequer based annuities could go as easily into arrears as source based payments. Moreover, if the annuity had to be recalled, the worth of its replacement was again dependent on royal goodwill. If the person was important enough, or the king took an interest in a particular case, steps would be taken to make sure payment from either source was made. If a man was fairly sure of himself in his position *vis à vis* the king, he might ask that

¹⁰⁵ See Steel, Receipt of the Exchequer, xxxi-xxxii.

¹⁰⁶ I have not been able to discuss annuitant preference within exchequer based annuities (eg. between fines and tenths and fifteenths), not because it did not happen, but because I have no evidence of it happening for my new creations. For lack of other evidence, I have had to assume that the source was what the exchequer clerks decided, not necessarily what the new man wanted. For preference within exchequer annuities, see Harriss, 'Preference at the Medieval Exchequer', 17-40.

¹⁰⁷ In the height of financial pressure on the exchequer, namely during the first phase of the Hundred Years War, Edward at times paid annuities through the gift of wool that had been collected. See the arrears paid to Edward Montagu of a £100 annuity by this method. CPR 1341-43, 269.

an exchequer annuity be granted him, even if previous provision in this respect had not been made. In May of 1349, John Beauchamp petitioned the king that if one of the sources which made up his £280 - namely, £166. 13s. 4d. out of the farm which Margery Ros of Hamelak, paid for the keeping of the lands late of Adam de Welle during the minority of the heir - came to an end, he should be paid from the exchequer.¹⁰⁸ Later, in March of 1351, Beauchamp was granted the whole £280 from the exchequer until the king could find him appropriate lands and rents.¹⁰⁹

Sometimes, the king might ask an individual to give up an annuity, and the nature of his recompense would again reflect his status with the king. In 1354, Thomas de Bradeston gave up the bailiwick of the prévôté of l'Entre-Deux Mers in the duchy of Aquitaine, which was then granted to Bertrand de Monte Ferandi.¹¹⁰ In recompense, Bradeston was granted 100 mark annuity out of the issues of the customs and subsidies of wool, hides and wool fells in the port of London. In another case, the man involved was yet to be in such a favourable position with the king, and so did not get as equitable a settlement. In March of 1337, Roger de Beauchamp, one of the king's yeomen but yet to be summoned to parliament, and Sibyl, his wife, were granted a "yearly allowance" of 100 marks at the Exchequer until sufficient land or rents would come in to either the couple or Roger's

¹⁰⁸ CPR 1348-50, 301.

¹⁰⁹ CPR 1350-54, 52. This was, however, quickly changed to an equivalent assignment off the ports of London and Boston. CPR 1350-54, 58.

¹¹⁰ CPR 1354-58, 54.

heirs.¹¹¹ The source was then changed to the farm of the town of Northampton in February of the next year - another case of preference of a determined and convenient source over an undetermined and perhaps inaccessible one.¹¹² This was paid with regularity throughout the next decade,¹¹³ but on 26 October 1351, the king granted a perpetual annuity to the warden and college of the king's free chapel of St. George, Windsor of 100 marks yearly of the farm of the town.¹¹⁴ This grant, along with one which seems to have been made to Walter de Manny of £50 from the town in the 1340's,¹¹⁵ must have severely taxed the town's resources. As Manny was still in great favour at this time, Beauchamp seems to have been the more likely to lose out of the two, and indeed was bought out of his annuity for 800 marks - essentially an eight year advance on his annuity paid in instalments through various sources at the exchequer.¹¹⁶ Beauchamp, however, lived until 1380, and therefore lost out on a considerable amount of potential income.

Having dealt with the way Edward III used annuities, the more general question must now be asked as to where Edward found the funds to fulfil these annuities and yet still be able to finance the Hundred Years War. There can be no

¹¹¹ CPR 1334-38, 394; Appendix 5b.

¹¹² CPR 1338-40, 17. In a later writ for payment it was stated that they had "besought the king to permit them to receive that sum of the said ferm because it is more convenient for them". CCR 1341-43, 65.

¹¹³ See Appendix 5b and other evidence of payment: E208/7/marked 32 Edward III; CCR 1341-43, 65, 438.

¹¹⁴ CPR 1350-54, 174.

¹¹⁵ CPR 1338-40, 332.

¹¹⁶ E403/359 (12 October, 19 October, 20 October, 29 November, 10 December 1351).

definitive answer to this, especially as there are no discernible chronological trends as to use of the different types of sources against more general developments connected with the financing of the war.¹¹⁷ However, it should at least be noted that at all times during the main phase of both Edward's endowment programme and the war in France, that is from 1337-1360, there was an everpresent mixture of credit arrangements and parliamentary grants which helped offset any drain on royal funds which Edward might have faced as a result of the payment of annuities. Whether it was payments from the wool syndicate or loans from Italian bankers in the late 1330's, the development of the great customs monopolies in the mid 1340's, or the granting of various taxes and subsidies until the peace of Calais,¹¹⁸ Edward in practice always seems as a result to have had enough available money on hand both to fulfil his obligations to his new creations and to finance campaigns in France.¹¹⁹ In only one instance early on in the war, that which resulted in the Walton Ordinances of 1338, was there any attempt to curtail payment

¹¹⁷ See Appendix 5a.

¹¹⁸ For the financing of the Hundred Years War, see see E.B. Fryde, 'Materials for the Study of Edward III's Credit Operations, 1327-48', BIHR xxii (1949), 105-38 and BIHR xxiii (1950), 1-30; S.B. Terry, The Financing of the Hundred Years War: 1337-1369 (1914), passim; Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, 231 ff; Ormrod, 'English Crown and the Customs', 27-39.

¹¹⁹ Especially when grants were being made by parliament when there was no active campaigning going on. See Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, 321-23. It should be noted that most of the time, payment of annuities came from sources traditionally under the king's control - namely county farms, customs, etc. However, that Edward did not avoid using communally granted money to pay annuities may be seen in his fulfilment of many payment of exchequer annuities from tenths and fifteenths. See Appendix 5b.

of annuities,¹²⁰ and even then most of Edward's new men appear to have obtained payment.¹²¹ These annuity payments, then, may be seen as important to Edward III in this period as the fulfilment of his more mundane commitments connected with campaigning in France.

In the end, Edward's success in getting a substantial amount of the annuities granted to his new men paid, totalling in all over £8000 per annum, was a considerable feat - one which was, as we have seen, accomplished by the use of two types of annuity, one granted through exchequer assignment and the other direct from the revenue source. Availability had a certain amount to do with how annuities were granted out - and in this source based assignments seem to have been the more important component -¹²² but more can be put down to a selective use of both types of annuity in an attempt to reflect the specific needs of each new creation as well as his position with respect to the king. But what, in the end, must have united both types of annuity, at least in the eyes of a new man, was the mixture of adaptability and reliability. These two qualities, more than anything else, made annuities if not equal replacement for land - especially as a source of social standing - then at least a worthy substitute, allowing the annuitant enough liquid funds to live in the lifestyle befitting a noble. And, if McFarlane

¹²⁰ Indeed, in the first phase of the Hundred Years War, as a result of the Walton Ordinances, the Treasurer and Chamberlains of the exchequer had, apart from fixed salaries, to clear all expenditures with the king. Harriss, King, Parliament, and Public Finance, 224-25; Hughes, Social and Constitutional Tendencies, 48.

¹²¹ For examples of payments made after the Walton Ordinances came into effect, see Appendix 5b.

¹²² See Appendix 5c.

was correct in stating that "the greater part of the earnings of the nobility was neither hoarded nor invested; it was used to achieve a higher standard of luxury",¹²³ Edward's new men were well in need of free cash not only to support themselves, their families and retainers, but also to keep up with the often extravagant tastes of their more established compatriots.¹²⁴

¹²³ McFarlane, Nobility, 96.

¹²⁴ On noble expenditure in this period, see McFarlane, Nobility, 83-101. According to Mertes, "To ignore this kind of visual language was to invite social and political downfall". K. Mertes, The English Noble Household 1250-1600: Good Governance and Politic Rule (1988), 103.

CHAPTER SIX

Miscellaneous Patronage

As we have seen in the preceding chapters, Edward III's patronage programme was essentially defined by a mixture of the resources open to him at any given time and the interests of his new creations. Whether it be the gift of a marriage or forfeiture, escheat or wardship, the timing of opportunities for such grants was mainly dictated by circumstances outside of royal control. Only with annuities could the king be relatively sure of an immediately available source of endowment - and even then there could be problems. Not only was payment of the annuity dependent upon the health, or otherwise, of the source from which it was granted, but it was also not feasible for Edward III to incur such obligations too freely - pressed, as he was, for money to finance the Scottish and French war efforts.

This last point was particularly important for all the sources discussed thus far. For with the grants analyzed in the previous four chapters, there was often little or no immediate recompense for the king - something fairly extravagant in a period of stretched resources such as usually exists during a war. There was, in some instances, the strengthening of royal power by the exercise of some as yet unfulfilled right, as when creations were given warrant to take annuities from sources which had hitherto been unforthcoming to official pressure. Or there could be a more general strengthening of the king's presence in an area due to the grant to a favourite of lands or rights therein. Nonetheless, many grants offered no immediate benefit to the king, and rather were detrimental to his readily available

sources of income - especially, the amount of money available at the exchequer. In other words, creation endowment was often an extended term investment with any immediate dividends being repaid in potentialities rather than more tangible recompense.

Consequently, the king also used a miscellany of less costly sources to keep his new creations feeling 'favoured' until he was able, or felt it appropriate, to give them more substantial grants. In many ways, these last sources could be referred to as "routine patronage" - being, as they were, not only common to many members of the nobility, but also the by-product of the normal functioning of the administration. But, by treating many of his new creations to this more informal type of patronage - which, if they had been subject to it before, was nowhere near the amount they now received - Edward III was in essence again helping to bring them into the world of the older noble families, a vital process if he was not to face divisions even more serious than those which had defeated Edward II. Thus though such acts' social and symbolic importance not infrequently outweighed their economic potential, this last series of sources may be seen as crucial in further promoting the unity and stability of the noble class as a whole during the reign.

Perhaps the most readily visible patronage of this type was the grant of offices, commissions, embassies and various other situations which were to come up during the course of the reign. No matter what, these had to be filled, and it was often a good way to get the old and new peerage to work together. There were, first of all, numerous temporary

appointments such as places on various juries, commissions and embassies. Every substantial landowner could expect to be placed on at least a few of these during the course of his career. This employment seems to have been a good way for an individual periodically to make his presence felt either in the local community, the kingdom as a whole or, in the case of embassies, the international scene. In the case of his presence in the locality, this most often meant a seat on various judicial or military commissions in a county where he had substantial interests. William le Blount, by no means an extraordinary example, was, in the space of six years, on five such commissions.¹ Such exposure not only helped a new man's prestige in a given area, but could also advance the interests of those connected with him. Likewise, the presence of a peer on national and international commissions and embassies was, by indicating the king's trust in his judgement, bound to increase his prominence both at home and abroad. Thomas Brewes' place on a commission to look into the abuses of the king's ministers in 1341 -² the start of the retributions by Edward III on account of his forced withdrawal from the continent -³ or Walter Manny's presence, in 1359, on a commission to the French concerning a possible truce,⁴ can both be seen as useful reinforcements of the

¹ 2 November 1331: Commission of the peace in Staffordshire (CPR 1330-34, 137); 26 January 1335: Commission of array for Worcestershire (CPR 1334-38, 137); 26 July 1335: Commission of the peace for Worcestershire (CPR 1334-38, 210); 12 August 1336: Commission of arrest (CPR 1334-38, 358); 3 April 1337: Oyer and Terminer commission (CPR 1334-38, 448)

² CCR 1339-41, 609.

³ Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, 283-84.

⁴ Foedera Conventiones Litterae et Cuiuscunque Generis Acta Publica, iii, ed. T. Rymer (1819-1869), 417.

position of a new man. But perhaps the most important, and obvious, way to increase a new man's stature, as well as his ability to work with the older nobility, was to place him on the royal council. Between the years 1331 and 1377, eighteen of Edward's new creations appear on royal charter witness lists, thus presumably giving them some part in the council of the king.⁵ Though there are some notable individuals missing from these lists - for example Thomas Bradeston, Thomas Holand and Michael Poynings - they nonetheless account for many of the new creations to whom Edward III took it upon himself to show substantial favour.

There were, however, more permanent posts to which a new man could aspire to rise through the king's patronage. Such positions had always been a way for a king to show favour to his friends, and from this Edward III did not deviate.⁶ Thirty-three of Edward's new peers received at least one such office during their careers, sixteen receiving three or more, from a total of eighty-eight major offices given out to these men in the period 1330-77.⁷ The offices were from a variety of sources. Some were dependent upon the geography of the creation's holdings, especially when it came to posts like the shrievalty. Though seen to be starting into a decline in this period, this was still an important office to the royal administration.⁸ In terms of patronage, it was usually

⁵ See Given-Wilson, 'Royal Charter Witness Lists', 61-73.

⁶ For example, see Church, 'The Rewards of Royal Service', 293; for the period after Edward III, see R.A.K. Mott, 'A Study in the Distribution of Patronage, 1389-99', Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society: Literature and History Section Proceedings xv pt. 5 (1974), 114, 118-20; 128-30.

⁷ See Appendix 6.

⁸ W.A. Morris, 'The Sheriff', in EGW, ii, 41; H.M. Jewell, English Local Administration (1972), 186. Moreover, the fact

reserved for the larger land owners of the county,⁹ often due to the numerous local duties connected with such a post. Though mostly granted with an eye to where a peer had power, it is nonetheless notable that many of the shrievalties granted to these men were for counties perceived to be open to constant external threats. For example, the office of the sheriff of York was held by three of those either elevated or to be elevated during the course of the reign - namely William Aton, Ralph Bulmer and Thomas Musgrave.¹⁰ Or, the grant of such an office might be in connection with more newly arisen threats to an area of the kingdom, as when Roger Kerdeston was granted the shrievalty of Norfolk and Suffolk, which, it seems, was under threat of naval attacks by the Scots and French at the time.¹¹ Often, if one man was particularly useful to and trusted by the king, he could end up holding a number of local offices. Aside from the shrievalty of York given on a number of occasions to Musgrave, as noted above, he was also made at various times during his career deputy sheriff of Westmoreland, custodian of Appleby Castle, keeper of the Western March of Scotland, keeper of Berwick, as well as escheator for the northern counties.¹² Indeed, this was clear evidence that experience

that, until late in the reign the rule of an annual change of sheriffs tended to be ignored, made these offices all the more useful. On this tendency, see Ormrod, Edward III, 80.

⁹ See Saul, Knights and Esquires, 108-09; Morris, 'The Sheriff', 48.

¹⁰ CFR 1356-68, 391-92; CFR 1369-77, 36, 190; CFR 1327-37, 199. See also PRO Lists and Indexes IX: Lists of Sheriffs for England and Wales (1963), 161-2.

¹¹ CFR 1327-37, 262. He was made custodian of the coasts of Norfolk and Suffolk to this end in 1333. Rotuli Scotiae i, 250.

¹² See Appendix 6.

and ability did tell, as the king was unlikely to grant posts repeatedly in such a turbulent area to an unworthy candidate.

The grant of the control of castles similarly reinforced both a new creation's status in his sphere of influence as well as the king's more general control in the localities. Sometimes, as noted in previous chapters, castle grants were made in fee or other more permanent arrangements, and thus may be said to be augmenting a peer's estate.¹³ But, due to the importance of castles in times of strife, domestic or foreign, as well as their part in the administrative machinery of the kingdom, the king always preferred to keep the ownership of the more strategic fortifications in his own hands, giving only the custodianship of them to others.¹⁴ The constablenesship of Dover Castle, along with the wardenship of the Cinque Ports, appears to have always gone to individuals deeply in Edward's favour and trust, moving from William Clinton in 1330, to Roger Mortimer the younger upon his death, thence to John Beauchamp of Warwick.¹⁵ Similarly, the custodianship of the Tower of London seemed to go to those in the inner circle of new men, such as when John Darcy was appointed to the office for life in 1346.¹⁶ Darcy's son was later granted the Tower, but, due to some form of incapacity, Darcy then granted it to John de Beauchamp of Warwick.¹⁷

¹³ See Appendix 2.

¹⁴ The line between royal and baronial castles, however, was often blurred. N.J.G. Pounds, The Medieval Castle in England and Wales: A Social and Political History (1990), 75-90, 130-145.

¹⁵ CPR 1358-61, 328; G.E.C., vi, 648-50. For Clinton's time in this position, see Parker, 'Patronage and Service', 191-202.

¹⁶ CPR 1345-48, 55.

¹⁷ CPR 1350-54, 241.

More prestigious military offices may also be seen as a form of patronage. Sometimes, these were hereditarily transferred, as when William de Bohun became constable of England in 1338 after his brother had been incapacitated.¹⁸ But competence seems to have been the key issue in the selection of a new creation for an office. Some of Edward's new men were constantly called to a certain office, thus more than likely indicating a proficiency in that role. John Beauchamp of Warwick was made admiral three times during the reign, once of the Fleet off Calais in 1349, then of the Western Seas in 1355, and finally Admiral for the North, South and West in 1360.¹⁹ Similarly, Walter Manny was made Admiral of the Fleet North of the Thames, once in 1337 and again in 1348.²⁰ Often, indeed, it seems that certain men were marked out by their military ability and were to hold a variety of such offices. William de Bohun held four major military commissions during his career, including the admiralship of the northern fleet and the position of King's Lieutenant in Brittany, while Henry de Grosmont, one of the most militarily minded men of the reign, held no fewer than five such positions.²¹

The abilities of other of Edward's new creations, however, lay in different areas. For these men,

¹⁸ CPR 1338-40, 91, 95. Connected with this, Bohun was granted the manor of Fulmodeston (Kent) by his brother. CPR 1338-40, 91.

¹⁹ G.E.C. ii, 50-51.

²⁰ G.E.C. viii, 572.

²¹ Captain General in Scotland (1336); King's Lieutenant in Flanders and Calais (1348); Admiral of the Fleet in the South (1351); Admiral of the Fleet South and West of the Thames (1351); Lieutenant and Captain in Duchy of Brittany (1355). See G.E.C. vii, 401-08.

administration offered equally challenging yet prestigious posts.²² Indeed, whether it was Richard le Scrope filling the office of Treasurer in the 1370's, or John Grey the Stewardship of the Household starting in 1350, these offices often took a considerable amount of administrative talent to fulfil.²³ Some of these men, as with military posts, showed an obvious bent for the paperwork involved, and were asked back again and again. John Darcy seemed such a man. Having already held the shrievalties of Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire, Lancashire and Yorkshire, as well as various other commissions during the reign of Edward II,²⁴ in the reign of his son, Darcy held the justiciarship of Ireland from 1332 to 1337, the stewardship of the royal household from 1337 to 1340, and was again appointed justicar for Ireland in 1340, this time for life.²⁵ Indeed, it was a mark of his administrative ability that he appointed a deputy for the latter office, "as the king could not dispense with his continual attendance", and instead took up the post of royal chamberlain in 1341.²⁶

²² Indeed, lest too much emphasis should be placed on the martial aspects of elevation, one should remember McFarlane's statement that "The 'peerage creations' of even so martial a king as Edward III were earned by counsel and by diplomatic and administrative service than by prowess in war alone". McFarlane, Nobility, 276.

²³ CPR 1370-74, 61. G.E.C. vi, 146.

²⁴ G.E.C. iv, 55-56.

²⁵ See Appendix 6.

²⁶ CPR 1340-43, 144. He formally resigned the justiciarship in 1344. G.E.C. iv, 57. That such posts were considered a form of patronage by Edward III was indicated in a grant on 12 December 1339 in which Gilbert Talbot was made justiciar of South Wales for life on account of "the approved fidelity which the king from his childhood has ever found him". CPR 1338-40, 402.

Financially, these offices often carried with them substantial fees, though at least part of this would have gone to the upkeep of the office.²⁷ In Ireland, John Darcy, as justicar, was to have £500 a year from the Exchequer of Dublin, promising to keep twenty men-at-arms while the tenure of his office lasted.²⁸ For the captaincy of Calais, Reginald de Cobham was to receive 400 marks a year.²⁹ The constablenesship of the Castle of Dover and the wardenship of the Cinque Ports meant that John Beauchamp of Warwick, "for his sustenance and robes as well as that of chaplains, servants, and watchmen", received £300 yearly, to be made up from the castle-guard rents, issues and customs of the port of Dover and the rest from the exchequer.³⁰ Even the appointment of William Aldeburgh as valet to Edward Balliol, the English backed claimant to the Scottish throne, brought with it grants of land and rent - though most of these were nominally made by Balliol.³¹

Offices, however, were not the only way that Edward III could further show favour to his new men. It could be also done through a variety of royal writs which could either forgive peers certain debts or transgressions or allow them certain rights. First of all, there were the pardons of

²⁷ See Mott, 'Distribution of Patronage', 114.

²⁸ CPR 1330-34, 340.

²⁹ As recorded in the issues rolls. E403/373 (18 October 1353).

³⁰ CPR 1358-61, 328; Parker, 'Patronage and Service', 192.

³¹ CDRS iii, 288-89; CPR 1354-58, 142-3; CCR 1360-64, 467. And, though such fees were often spent on the upkeep of the offices, the individuals holding them appear to have been paid fairly regularly. Indeed, at least from exchequer records, and especially the Issue Rolls, there seems to be little firm evidence of mass nonpayment of these offices. See E403 passim.

various obligations and crimes. Though these were given to those at all levels of society, the weighty nature of some of these do mark them apart. Some cases were "one-offs", such as a forgiveness of a debt of William Heron due to hardships of service on the Scottish March.³² Similarly, in November of 1330, Hugh de Audley and his wife were forgiven the rents and exactions connected with her inheritance to the value of £2000,³³ and in late 1332 a respite on all exchequer debts.³⁴ Other cases of debt pardon were more far reaching. Thomas Bradeston is a good case in point. Originally, on 28 February 1335, Bradeston was granted a pardon until Michaelmas of "all the debts, ferms and arrears of ferms which he owes to the king, and to cause him to be released from any distraint made for that cause".³⁵ On 15 September of the same year this was then extended to the Hilary term,³⁶ and continued with such pardons through till the end of the decade.³⁷ Though such allowances did cause the king a certain degree of loss, especially when it concerned the general pardon of rents on all lands of an estate, it nonetheless was one of the more convenient ways to show royal favour.

Equally important to a new peer were the royal pardons for various crimes and trespasses. These were especially important in respect to the problems of the last reign, as there were a number of Edward's new creations who had been

³² E208/3/Large file 1(bottom set).

³³ E159/106/38.

³⁴ E208/2/83/bundle 3; E208/2/74 bundle 3.

³⁵ CCR 1333-37, 468.

³⁶ CCR 1333-37, 528.

³⁷ Notably, even through a period of increasing financial stringency. For examples, see CCR 1333-37, 715; CCR 1337-39, 267; CPR 1338-40, 178, 381.

actively involved in the politics of the 1320's and therefore often very much in need of pardon. Indeed, the number of individuals still held by financial bonds for good behaviour from the previous reign gave Edward III considerable leeway in granting this type of patronage. William Montagu was forgiven £12000 in bonds which he had been held to by the Despensers during the reign of Edward II,³⁸ as was Hugh de Audley.³⁹ Earlier, in January of 1331, Audley had been forgiven a £10000 fine as a result of the rebellion at Bedford in 1329.⁴⁰ Furthermore, on 6 October 1331, Audley was pardoned for "aid to king and his mother to pursue the Despensers",⁴¹ and on 4 November 1331, any other lands of Audley still held by the king were ordered to be returned.⁴²

Pardons for various reasons, however, could also be given to new peers for the sake of others. Sometimes, this could simply entail getting a friend or retainer out of a spot of trouble, as when William Clinton obtained a pardon for Walter atte Beche concerning the death of Richard Cheseman in March 1340.⁴³ A more notable case is the pardon of Robert de Folville at the petition of William de Bohun, Edward de Bohun and John de Grey of Rotherfield, his mainpernors, on 4 November 1332.⁴⁴ This, indeed, was a fairly gracious act by

³⁸ E159/106/24.

³⁹ E208/2/88(bundle 3) CCR 1333-37, 96. There were also respites on the payment of various debts to the Despensers, the right to which was now held by the king as a result of their forfeiture. E208/2/110(bundle 3); CCR 1330-33, 608.

⁴⁰ CPR 1330-34, 35. This was later noted as being a £12000 recognisance. CPR 1330-34, 410. Other new peers forgiven such bonds include William le Blount. CPR 1330-34, 28.

⁴¹ CPR 1330-34, 172.

⁴² CCR 1330-33, 364.

⁴³ CPR 1338-40, 457.

⁴⁴ CPR 1330-34, 367-68.

the king, Folville being a key member of the Folville-Cotteril gang,⁴⁵ and being worth a 1000 mark bond which these three men had to enter into to ensure his good behaviour. Such pardons were of great value to a new man as they enhanced his position both among his peers and subordinates.⁴⁶

Licences for various acts were another convenient, and cheap, way in which the king could show favour to his new men. In some cases, it was just a licence prompted by some mild feeling of royal favour, as when, in July of 1334, Thomas Bradeston was given licence to fell and sell wood from within the King's chase of Fillewode (Somerset),⁴⁷ or in July of 1338 when Reginald Cobham was granted licence to cut down oaks to the value of £100 in the "foreign" woods of Hertle (Buckinghamshire).⁴⁸ In others, such licences were a necessary aid to a peer's well being. On 12 October 1350, just such a grant was given to Guy Brian.⁴⁹ On that date, Brian was granted licence, as a result of the outbreak of the plague the year before, to fell underwood in the forest of Dean as well as the right to profit from the wood in order to help pay the farm of his lands there.⁵⁰

⁴⁵ E.L.G. Stones, 'The Folvilles of Ashby-Folville, Leicestershire, and their Associates in Crime 1326-1347,' TRHS 5th Series (1957), 117-36.

⁴⁶ Similarly, a new man could be granted favours to help a business associate in an hour of need, as when Roger Beauchamp gained a respite for Richard Damory concerning evidence of debts in an on-going court case. CCR 1349-54, 483; CPR 1350-54, 181. Despite this, however, Beauchamp and Damory were later at loggerheads in the courts over land in Newton Pley. See CP40/379/3.

⁴⁷ CPR 1330-34, 558.

⁴⁸ CPR 1338-40, 116.

⁴⁹ CPR 1350-54, 5.

⁵⁰ The previous November, as a result of the plague, Brian had also been excused £100 of the £120 due for custody of St.

In other cases, more permanent rights could be involved, such as licences for free warrens, markets, fairs, etc. - all of which have been noted as being, on the whole, only granted to nobles,⁵¹ and therefore yet another way of treating the newcomers as the established nobility. In April of 1340, Reginald de Cobham and his heirs were granted "of special grace" the free warren of all their demesne lands of Orkesden, Shoreham, Eynsford, Chiddingstone, Hever, Penshurst, Cowden, Leigh, Edenbridge, Aldington, Thornham, East Shelve, Wethelynge, Charing, Lenham, Newegare, Halgstow, Frindsbury, and Stoke (Kent), Grinstead and Hartfield (Sussex), and Lingfield (Surrey).⁵² A like grant was also made to John Darcy for all his demesne lands of Temple Newsomkirk in Yorkshire.⁵³ Similarly, care of one's soul was as important as the augmentation of one's estate during this period, and, as a result, licences were often needed for religious benefactions as well. On 29 August 1342, the king granted John Darcy licence to alienate in mortmain to the prior and convent of Saint Bartholemew's, Smithfield, London a messuage, 200 acres of land, 8 acres of meadow, 8 acres of pasture, 6 acres of wood, and 38s of rent, in Tewin, Hertfordyngbery, and Panshanger (Hertfordshire).⁵⁴

Royal favour could also be shown by writs meant to speed up the rate at which royal obligations were performed for a new man. Hugh Audley, having lately distinguished himself at

Briavels castle and the forest of Dean. CCR 1349-54, 116; E372/194/10/2.

⁵¹ Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 66.

⁵² CCharR 1327-41, 467.

⁵³ Harley 805 230/149. In the next year, 1345, he was also granted market rights for the town of Torksey. SC8/256/12788

⁵⁴ CPR 1340-43, 509-10

Sluys, on 10 July 1340 was assigned up to 1000 marks, "as the king is bound to him in that sum or thereabouts, as may appear by bills of the wardrobe made to him thereupon, as on account of his good service at sea against the king's enemies, the king wished him to be speedily satisfied".⁵⁵ That such was not always the case is indicated by the number of royal debts which continued to be unfulfilled, especially during the early phase of the Hundred Years War.⁵⁶ Moreover, individual warrants for issue for payment of a king's obligations to his new peers could also be a sign of favour. After all, though survival rates of these warrants make it somewhat difficult to be sure, it did not seem standard royal policy to grant such warrants for all payments in the reign, especially those from the exchequer.⁵⁷ Either it seems, at least in the case of Edward's new peers, to be used only for the more favoured, like Bohun,⁵⁸ or more powerful, like Hugh de Audley,⁵⁹ to ensure payment of royal obligations was made.

On the other hand, writs for the continuance of royal grants and obligations were also a form of patronage. Some did not receive such favour, as the treatment of royal grants which Oliver Ingham had received during the Minority seems to indicate.⁶⁰ But for those who did, such patronage was

⁵⁵ CCR 1339-41, 438.

⁵⁶ Probably occasioned by the Walton Ordinances. See Hughes, Social and Constitutional Tendencies, 48; on Edward's debts to international banking houses, see R.W. Kaeuper, War, Justice, and Public Order: England and France in the Later Middle Ages (1988), 54.

⁵⁷ Such annuities were otherwise covered by a general or dormant warrant. See p. 113 footnote 4.

⁵⁸ For example, warrant for issue: E404/3/21.

⁵⁹ For example, warrants for issue: E404/4/28; E404/5/29.

⁶⁰ In December of 1330, Ingham received the restitution of all his lands, except, importantly, those he held of the king's gift. CPR 1330-34, 22. There is, however, evidence

obviously worthwhile. Confirmations of rights were especially useful in this respect, as when John Darcy sought a confirmation connected with the lately acquired remainder of the manor of Torksey, granted to him in 1337.⁶¹ This request, considering its life tenant was a powerful noblewoman who was known to be in favour with the king,⁶² was probably very wise. Or it could be in the form of the acknowledgment of royal obligations from grants which had otherwise been reassigned, as when Darcy was promised recompense for money owing, and owed, from the manors of Edgefield and Walcott (Norfolk), which had been returned by Edward III to Thomas Rocelyn in 1327.⁶³ In this case, moreover, such royal interest was the precursor to a more important show of favour by the king. The grant of these manors, originally made in 1323 as a result of Rocelyn siding with Lancaster the previous year,⁶⁴ were returned to Rocelyn as a result of a general resumption of lands,⁶⁵ and the king, in November of 1328 granted Darcy for life the manor of Werk in Tindale.⁶⁶ Though this could easily have been later cancelled by Edward III due to Darcy's connections with the minority regime, it was nonetheless confirmed by the king in July of 1331.⁶⁷ But

that at least some of this earlier patronage, namely the farm of Andover (Hampshire), did make it back to Ingham.
E372/177/4/2ob.

⁶¹ SC8/206/10293; CPR 1343-45, 466; CCharR 1327-41, 428.

⁶² The countess of Pembroke. For an example of the king taking away an expectancy from a new man for her sake, see CPR 1340-43, 461.

⁶³ CCR 1330-33, 202-03, 250; SC8/239/11949; E404/11/-.

⁶⁴ CPR 1321-24, 332.

⁶⁵ CCR 1330-33, 202-03.

⁶⁶ CPR 1327-30, 335; CPR 1327-30, 373. Granted in fee on 4 March 1329. CCharR 1327-41, 118.

⁶⁷ CPR 1330-34, 158. For a useful summary of the grants made to Darcy in this period, see SC8/239/11949. Darcy also received recompense for £16 of rent in Ormesby (Norfolk) and

perhaps the most susceptible to possible recall in this respect were the grants of annuities. Unlike the often onerous task of removing an individual from the control of a piece of property, an annuity could be ended simply by one order. That, then, this did not happen to an annuity of William Clinton's, granted by Queen Isabella in 1327, and that, indeed, Edward saw to it that the arrears of it were paid, was a clear sign of favour to Clinton.⁶⁸

Similarly, royal favour had the potential to influence the outcome of court cases, especially reviving dormant claims to various properties.⁶⁹ In the late 1340's, after the battle of Neville's cross, Richard Lovel successfully pursued his claims to the barony of Hawick and other connected lands, properties which had been lost to Lovel's family after the Battle of Bannockburn, being granted by Robert the Bruce to, among others, Henry de Balliol.⁷⁰ Another case, also

the manors of Brocklesby and Gretham (Lincolnshire) which had been granted out during the Minority and had been called back in after 1330. CPR 1330-34, 268, 366. Thomas Bradeston was likewise favoured by the continuation of a grant concerning the castle and barton of Gloucester. CPR 1327-37, 238.

⁶⁸ Presumably part of a £200 annuity granted before 26 September 1327. CPR 1327-30, 174. Payments made in arrears for years 1328-43. E372/184/13/2ob; E372/193/9/1ob.

Conversely, that Clinton later lost some of the lands in connection with this annuity - namely the castle, manor and hundred of Halton (Cheshire) to Henry of Grosmont in 1348 - may in part be seen as a consequence of his subsequent lack of favour with the king, though it is notable he did receive assignments in recompense for this. CPR 1348-50, 195; CCR 1346-49, 571; SC1/41/109. See also p. 210 footnote 21.

⁶⁹ Edward seems to have realized the importance of a considered use of the legal system as a part of ruling and became more involved in it as the reign progressed. See Ormrod, Edward III, 54-56.

⁷⁰ Including the manor of Old Roxburgh, which his sons, Richard and James, had occupied earlier in the reign along with the two manors of Brill and Silverstone - which had been given to Lovel as recompense for Old Roxburgh in Edward II's time, the latter wishing to use it for the munition of the adjacent castle. CDRS iii, 275; Rotuli Scotiae i, 697; J.M.

concerning Scottish lands, involved John Stryvelyn and his wife's, Barnaba's, inheritance.⁷¹ In the late 1350's, Stryvelyn petitioned the king that he might have back part of his wife's inheritance. This land, originally held by her father, Adam de Swynburn, had been confiscated as a result of Swynburn's associations with the Scots in both the reigns of Edward I and II, and because Barnaba herself had been part of the household of Robert the Bruce. This appears to have been part of a newly developed policy of Edward III to charge individuals with treason for the offences of their fathers and grandfathers and declare their lands forfeit.⁷² Stryvelyn however, as a result of his previous good service, was granted back the lands in fee.⁷³

Indeed, Scottish lands seem to have been especially targeted for renewals of claims in this fashion - as in the case involving the Saint John estate and John de Saint Philbert. First married to Joan de Ufford, daughter of Robert de Ufford, by Margaret, widow of Thomas de Cailly, Lord Cailly,⁷⁴ Saint Philbert married secondly, when he was about twenty, Margaret sister and coheir of Edmund de Saint John, and daughter of Hugh, Lord Saint John, by Miribel his wife in September 1347, receiving a portion of her father's

Thomson, ed., The Register of the Great Seal of Scotland: 1306-1424 (1912), 7; CPR 1334-38, 527.

⁷¹ CDRS iv, 1-2.

⁷² See above, pp. 45 footnote 82. That these lands were not forfeited at the time of the alleged transgressions is obvious from the fact that the couple were recorded as being forgiven relief for Adam's estate upon his death in 1339. CDRS iii, 238.

⁷³ CPR 1358-61, 22.

⁷⁴ Ufford purchased the marriage in July of 1334. CPR 1330-34, 559. There were still some connections after the end of the marriage as well, such as a recognisance for 200 marks. CPR 1334-38, 176; CCR 1346-49, 425.

inheritance in the next month.⁷⁵ Soon thereafter, Margaret and John, as well as her sister Isabel and her husband, Luke Poynings, pursued claims to a grant made in the grandfather's time of 1000 marks concerning the castle of Botill.⁷⁶ Edward I had granted to John de Saint John, great-grandfather of the two heiresses, 1000 marks per annum at the exchequer until he gave him an equivalent landed estate in Scotland, and later gave him the Castle of Botill and other lands of Sir John de Balliol in fulfilment of this grant. Edward III then returned the lands to the Balliol family in the form of a grant to Sir Edward de Balliol, while Edmund, son and heir, was under age. In the early 1350's, the coheiresses and their husbands petitioned the king and his council to restore them to these lands, or give them lands of equal value. Though there is no firm evidence for Edward III's active influence, the fact that these men were favoured by the king doubtless had the potential to affect the outcome of the cases - something which would have not been lost to the men themselves and may have encouraged them in pursuing their wives' interests.

Even the profitability of acts which normally came under the initiative of the peer often was held in the balance by the favour of the king. The payment of ransoms, one of the most lucrative forms of booty during the early phases of the Hundred Years War, was often directly affected by how high in esteem the king held a man. Being, as it was, often only of any worth once it had been sold to the king who then could

⁷⁵ CFR 1347-56, 49.

⁷⁶ The PRO index has this listed as being c. 1349, though the CDRS puts the date between 1350 and 1360. SC8/67/3332; CDRS iv, 13.

sell it back to the enemy family involved, the king had a large say in how much his soldiers, including his new men, would get in any prisoner they captured.⁷⁷ In cases of extreme favour, the king could grant away all his right in a prisoner, as he did when he made a grant in November of 1371 to Guy de Brian of John, lord of Neufvill.⁷⁸ In other instances, the king essentially bought the prisoner from the peer in question. In September of 1348, as a "gift" for his service in the capture of Charles de Blois, the French claimant to the duchy of Brittany captured in 1347, Thomas Dagworth was promised the payment of the generous sum of 25000 florins in instalments out of the 10th and 15ths granted to the king.⁷⁹ Though payment was not made at the rate placed out in the original letters patent,⁸⁰ a substantial portion of it was gradually paid, even continuing after his death to his widow.⁸¹ In a similar instance in 1333, Walter de Manny was promised 1000 marks by the king for his capture of John Crabbe at Berwick, of which all but £100 seems to have been paid.⁸² It was uncommon, however, for the

⁷⁷ As Hay points out, an individual was supposed to get 'reasonable compensation' for a prisoner in his possession - though how this was executed was obviously dependent on the king's will. D. Hay, 'The Division of the Spoils of War in Fourteenth Century England', TRHS 5th series, iv (1954), 101-02. For the rules concerning ransoms in this period, see M.H. Keen, The Laws of War in the Late Middle Ages (1965), 156-85.

⁷⁸ CPR 1370-74, 146.

⁷⁹ CPR 1348-50, 146.

⁸⁰ Michaelmas 1348 (1000 marks), Easter 1349 (£1000), Michaelmas 1349 (£1000), Easter 1350 (£1000) and at Michaelmas 1350 (£1200 50 marks). CPR 1348-50, 146.

⁸¹ E403/344 (9 October 1348); E403/344 (16 March 1349); E403/347 (22 May 1349); E403/353 (15 April 1350); E403/353 (28 June 1350); E403/356 (22 September 1351); E403/362 (11 July 1352); E403/362 (6 September 1352).

⁸² E403/270 (11 October 1333); E403/270 (4 February 1334); E403/276 (25 April 1334); E403/279 (10 November 1334);

new man to be reimbursed for the whole amount of the ransom. Reginald de Cobham's share in the ransom of the Count of Longeville in 1359, that of 6500 'old florins',⁸³ which worked out roughly to 2000 pounds, appears to have been paid only in part, at least during the reign itself.⁸⁴

Whether as a result of the grant of offices, or the product of writs, up to now we have been discussing forms of patronage the main significance of which was social or economic value. Equally significant royal patronage could also be shown by symbolic acts meant to show the king's specific preference for an individual. Small grants of money were probably the most easily available of these. In April 1337, it was noted that the merchants of the society of the Peruzzi had paid out 50 marks to Reginald de Cobham as a gift from the king.⁸⁵ Grants of annuities of wine may be seen as another token manifestation of royal approval. In January 1348, Thomas Bradeston was granted, for life, an annuity of six tuns of wine in the port of Bristol, paying only the same for the king's prise.⁸⁶ Other grants had even more

E403/279 (17 December 1334); E403/279 (14 February 1335); E403/282 (19 August 1335).

⁸³ The patent roll entry for this notes an "old florin" as being worth 3s. 9 1/4d. CPR 1358-61, 167.

⁸⁴ Warrant for Issue E404/6/36 (12 February 1359); Payment received E403/394 (22 February 1359).

⁸⁵ CCR 1337-39, 42. There were larger 'gifts' to the new peers, as one of £1611 to William de Bohun in 1348. It is, however, unclear if payments like this were not, due to their specific amounts, the repayment of royal debts. CPR 1348-50, 40.

⁸⁶ CPR 1348-50, 2. Moreover, orders were constantly going out to the king's butler to make sure the annuity was paid and, as a result, the Pipe Rolls show it to have been fulfilled with marked regularity. For example, orders given on 24 January 1350 and 25 November 1350. CCR 1349-54, 129, 256. Examples of payments: E372/189/47/1; E372/192/42/1ob; E372/193/32/2; E372/195/42/2ob; E372/196/44/2.

significance as a show of favour, as when on 12 July 1335 Montagu was granted by the king a special honour, in fee the crest of the eagle, "which the king has borne as his own".⁸⁷ Similarly, the guardianship of the captured king of France, conferred upon Roger Beauchamp in 1359, was also an office of great import from which a considerable amount of prestige could be garnered.⁸⁸

Moreover, material favour to one's friends and kinsmen could be as important to a new man in its symbolic weight as any office or other grant, emphasizing the individual's heightened position within the kingdom. For example, on 11 December 1345, Robert de Bradeston was granted the marriage of Katherine, the widow of John de Dale, on account of the good service done by his father.⁸⁹ Earlier, in November of 1341, John Darcy 'le fitz', in part in consideration of the good service of John Darcy 'le cosyn' to both Edward II and Edward III, was granted the marriage of Elizabeth, daughter and heir of Nicholas de Menill.⁹⁰ Similarly, in August of 1347, Bohun also, at his request, and the forgiveness to the king of 2000 marks in royal debts owed to him, gained for Humphrey de Bohun, Earl of Hereford and Essex, his brother, all rights of reversion in the estate of his other brother, Edward Bohun, whose estate had recently come to him by the latter's death.⁹¹ In all these cases, the grant was made while the new creation was still living. In other instances,

⁸⁷ With which he also gained control of the reversion of the manors of Wodeton, Frome Whitfeld, Mersh[wode], Worth and Pole. CCharR 1327-41, 348; CPR 1338-40, 393; Appendix 2.

⁸⁸ Given-Wilson, 'Court and Household of Edward III', 175.

⁸⁹ CPR 1345-48, 26.

⁹⁰ CPR 1340-43, 352.

⁹¹ CPR 1345-48, 366-67.

the new creation had already died, but the grant was nonetheless made. In June of 1347, William Darcy, another son of John Darcy, was granted "in consideration of good and gratuitous service done by his father", as well as his own, of the castle of Mackynegan, in Ireland, for his life.⁹² In a variation on this theme, in July of 1346, William de Bohun was granted that, if he died within a set period of time after his departure from England on the king's service, the assignment made to him for that purpose would nonetheless be made, as well as the fee previously granted to sustain the rank of earl - all of which would doubtless come to aid his family.⁹³

Along with a more general use of status symbols such as membership in the Order of the Garter,⁹⁴ this variety of miscellaneous patronage, regular as it may have seemed to the old nobility,⁹⁵ nonetheless served two main purposes in Edward III's patronage programme. Firstly, by treating the new creations as he treated the old nobility, Edward was accustoming these men to the routine functioning of the class of which they were now a part. It is notable, then, that substantial portions of this patronage often came before a man actually became a peer or an earl. Indeed, this type of

⁹² CPR 1345-48, 331.

⁹³ CPR 1345-48, 150.

⁹⁴ Of Edward's new men, four were founding members, and six more were later added during the reign. For a list of the membership in the Order of the Garter, see G.F. Beltz, Memorials of the Order of the Garter (1841), cxlix-clii. See also Ormrod, Edward III, 18.

⁹⁵ For a discussion of a similar disbursement of miscellaneous patronage in the reign of Edward I, see D.A. Barrie, 'The Maiores Barones in the Second Half of the Reign of Edward I (1290-1307)', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Saint Andrews (1991), 305-79.

patronage, especially that of offices, proved a testing ground for the worthiness of new men, to see if they could handle all the aspects of their new ranks. This appears to be have been true with respect to his treatment of William Clinton, earl of Huntingdon. For, aside from grants which appear to have been meant to cover the extra expenses of his frequent trips to France on royal service,⁹⁶ the only estate patronage which Clinton received up until 1337 was that connected with his wife's rights to various lands.⁹⁷ Rather Edward's method of reward to such a man early on consisted of appointing him to responsibilities by which he could further prove himself. In 1333, Clinton was charged with two offices, justice of Chester and the Constable of Dover Castle and Warden of the Cinque Ports, as well as the custody of the castles of Chester, Becherston, Rhuddlan, and Flint and the county of Flint.⁹⁸ In the following years, up until the outbreak of war with France in 1337, he was a constant companion of the king on his Scottish campaigns, made Admiral of the West in 1333, and used in diplomatic missions to the continent.⁹⁹ This, then, was a way not only to show gratitude but also to train an elite in whom he could have faith and confidence to help him run his kingdom.

⁹⁶ For example, when "certain debts" were written off the day before he was sent on a commission to France concerning Aquitaine. See CPR 1330-34, 532, 534; CCR 1333-37, 215.

⁹⁷ Most importantly, when he was given the wardship of several manors of his stepson's estate. CFR 1327-37, 245. See also above, pp. 82, 102.

⁹⁸ CPR 1330-34, 13. GEC iii, 648-49.

⁹⁹ CPR 1330-34, 273, 466, 467, 532, 534; CPR 1334-38, 30. G.E.C. iii, 648-49. For a more indepth look at some of Clinton's diplomatic activities, as well as those of Bohun, Ufford and Montagu, see Parker, 'Patronage and Service', 150-53.

Secondly, Edward's use of this type of patronage helped to unify the peerage by bringing the old and new nobility together not just in their treatment by the king, but also in their duties. A new creation's place on various embassies and commissions along with the older peerage was bound not only to teach them something of how to act, but also increase their sense of common interest with these more established families. Though they might otherwise have come into contact, it would not necessarily have been at an equal level, and especially not at a level which would have the potential to foster trust and respect between the old and new nobility. In many ways, then, miscellaneous patronage, while a routine part of the workings of royal government, was nonetheless a necessary part of any programme of elevation.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Contemporary Reaction

From these sources, then, came Edward III's patronage to his new creations. In many ways, this programme had known no previous equal, connected as it was with the development of a stabilized individual summons list which came to define the parliamentary peerage. Indeed, by taking upon himself the task of elevating sixty-seven men over the course of the reign and by furthermore having to find the resources to patronize about half of these in order to give them varying levels of self sufficiency - and the other half to keep them contented - Edward III was doing something quite novel in the annals of English history.

Unlike today, however, novelty was not necessarily seen as a virtue in the Middle Ages and, in a society bound by, and indeed dependent upon, the importance of tradition - both concerning land tenure and social status - such a policy by the king was likely to excite comment, if not reaction. But to understand the response Edward's endowment programme elicited, we must first realize that it took place on two levels - one of individual self interest and the second of more general contemporary reaction. For the first of these levels there is a wealth of information due to the almost complete survival of the records of the central courts - namely the Courts of Kings Bench and of Common Pleas. These were the ultimate venues whereby contemporaries could show discontent at what they perceived to be injustices. The amount of individual complaint concerning a grant tended to depend mainly upon the source of the patronage. Some grants, obviously, individual subjects of the kingdom had little say

over. The right for the king to grant annuities from royal revenue sources was probably the most obvious case of this. Though there could be a number of claimants upon a particular source of revenue, and they might have to compete for it with the officer involved, there was rarely any effective questioning of the fact that the king was perfectly within his power to make such grants to his new men, even when annuity payments were being regularly made out of monies granted by parliament.¹ It is therefore unsurprising that these sources ended up being the reserve mechanism when all other sources of royal patronage were found in some way wanting.²

Wardships and marriages were equally within the king's rights to grant out. For, just as it has been shown that use of the royal demesne as a source of royal patronage was not something which the monarch had to shy away from,³ so too was his use of wardships and marriages viewed as a necessary part of the larger exercise of royal largesse.⁴ Indeed, it was seen as the king's duty to distribute the fruits of these rights as part of the workings of medieval kingship. Nonetheless, the practical application of the king's feudal rights over his tenants-in-chief could be problematic. For, though no subject would ever deny the king's right to grant

¹ See Appendix 5b, especially payments made from parliamentary tenths and fifteenths. Though there was considerable debate over more general royal use of funds granted by parliament. See also Ormrod, Edward III, 49; Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, 313-55.

² Though there is, in at least one instance, evidence that Thomas de Holland questioned Thomas Bradeston's right to a farm from the town of Gloucester in 1354. See SC8/244/12288.

³ Wolffe, Royal Demesne, 52-75.

⁴ Waugh, Lordship of England, 180-93.

out as he wished the bodies and marriages of the heirs of his tenants-in-chief,⁵ the delineations of what constituted the estate of any minor or widow was bound to be disputed. Simple jurisdictional rights could cause numerous headaches for the holder of a wardship. For example, in 1370, Ralph Basset, who held lands in wardship of the heir of John Mowbray of Axilholm, was ordered to allow the proctor in England of the abbot of Fecamp to exercise, among other rights, his right to "5 good bucks in time of grease(in gresso) and 5 does in time of fermison, all whole with their hides" in the woods of Stanherst and Rippefeld, a right that the abbot had going back to the time of Henry III.⁶ Again in 1370, presumably on or about the time he was granted the wardship, Basset was ordered to pay to one John Dysworth arrears of 40s., and to pay it to him in future, which John Mowbray had granted the latter as an annuity for reporting the birth of his daughter.⁷ Another claim on the wardship of the Mowbray estate came from a religious house of "le Sele" on 12 June 1371 when Basset was ordered to "cause a tithe of all the rents of the barony of Brembre to be paid them", which Basset, according to the monks' petition to the king, was otherwise unwilling to pay to them.⁸

But, considering its temporary nature, it is unsurprising that litigation concerning wardships was generally routine. Indeed, of the two rights, marriage seems to have been the

⁵ According to Walker "because of the clarity of the royal claim and the efficiency of the administration, the king was rarely put to suit about wardships". Walker, 'The Feudal Family and the Common Law Courts', 15.

⁶ CCR 1369-74, 149.

⁷ CCR 1369-74, 155.

⁸ CCR 1369-74, 238.

more contested - affecting, as it did, not only the transmission of inheritances but also the fate of dowers, maritagiums and marriage portions. By far the most controversial marriage grants were those concerning the marriage of a new creation himself. Indeed, considering the sometimes substantial space in social rank between husband and wife as witnessed in Chapter Three, a new creation had to be ready to defend the wealth connected with his wife from claimants of a variety of backgrounds. In some cases, this involved the dower connected with a widow's previous marriage. For example, around 1350, Guy Brian married Elizabeth, widow to both Hugh Despenser and Giles Badlesmere. In the Hilary term of 1355 the couple started a suit in the Court of Common Pleas against Margery de Roos, sister and coheir to Badlesmere, over a third of the manor of Bradfield Combust (Suffolk).⁹ The Brians claimed this as dower from Elizabeth's first marriage to Giles de Badlesmere (d.1338). However, Margery claimed that the manor was not part of the dower of Elizabeth, because Giles had not died seised of the manor - the time at which the apportioning of dower usually took place. Rather, Margery then claimed that Giles had demised the manor to Thomas Verdon for life, so that after his death the right of reversion of that manor and all connected lands was to descend to all four sisters and coheiresses of Giles Badlesmere, namely Margery herself, Elizabeth Bohun, Maud de Veer and John, son of Margaret, late wife of John Tybetot. Though Verdon was obviously in fairly firm control of the land as Elizabeth had been pursuing cases

⁹ CP40/380/215.

to reclaim her dower portion from him for a number of years previous to her marriage to Brian,¹⁰ the judges finally seem to have sided with Brian and his wife, for the property involved was noted as being in the possession of the couple on the death of Elizabeth in 1359 - only after which it was returned to Margery.¹¹

Indeed, considering Giles Badlesmere had died over a decade before their marriage, Brian seems to have had quite a time assembling his wife's dower, as further cases against the earls of Northampton and Oxford, John Avenel, John Tibetot, and Thomas Arundel illustrate.¹² But dowers were not the only problem for new creations. Life grants of all types could be a barrier to a full realization of the potential of a wife's estate. In the Michaelmas term of 1337, William de Bohun, earl of Northampton and Elizabeth, widow of Edmund de Mortimer (d. 1332) sought against Joan, late the wife of Roger Mortimer, Edmund's father, a third part of the manors of Dolforwyn, Bettws, Garthmyl, Penrhyn, Aberbechan, Garthgelin, Llanllwchaiarn, Rundoedelew, Aberhafesp, Edeffryn, Llanitheon, Tregynon, Launcothelan, Manafon, Gaynong, Penebont, Lees, Maunans, Llan, Uchweldrefbettons, Kylkethwyn, Pennowern, Nenee, Ekil, Eberrew, Bryncae-maes-hir, Rallussa, Eueynor, Llanfair, Egynae, Kilgeygan, Llanmerewig, Broniyond, Bolbro, Bryntalch, Llandyssil, Newtown, Leyrwyk and Tolnetun, all in Montgomeryshire, as the dower of Elizabeth as a result of her marriage to Edmund.¹³

¹⁰ CP40/324/504, CP40/325/163, CP40/343/260.

¹¹ CCR 1354-60, 583.

¹² CP40/369/125; CP40/380/215.

¹³ See Appendix 7. CP40/312/446; CP40/314/206. See also CCR 1337-39, 421-22.

Joan, however, claimed that the said lands were hers by the grant of Edmund for her life. In the end it seems to have been decided that Joan did have a right to the land as she died seized thereof in 1359 - three years after Elizabeth, thereby never giving Bohun control over the lands.¹⁴

But dower or similar grants for the sake of sustaining a widow were not the only things at issue with respect to a creation's marriage. A new man's rights by his wife's inheritance could also be a point of contention. A case in point concerns two of Edward's creations, John Kirkton and Ralph Cromwell, and the castle of Tattershall (Lincolnshire) and connected lands. In 1334, John Dryby granted Kirkton Tattershall, apparently by word of mouth.¹⁵ Though Kirkton later obtained royal licence for this grant,¹⁶ he still seems to have been very nervous about the solidity of his claim over the lands, and throughout the next three decades made various legal arrangements to make his control as firm as possible.¹⁷ At some point before July of 1364, however, there were the first inklings of trouble over the property, when the king claimed certain feudal rights over the lands - though as a favour to Kirkton he quashed this action.¹⁸ The important point here was that it was noted that not only did no charter accompany the original 1334 grant, but that none

¹⁴ In the Inquisitions Post Mortem, the lands involved were said to revert to Roger Mortimer and his heirs. CIPM x, 255. The Bohuns and Joan Mortimer also seem to have been involved in a dispute over the manor of Clebury Mortimer. CP40/386/43.

¹⁵ By the words "I give to thee this castle". CPR 1361-64, 520; G.E.C. viii, 338. Kirkton was later pardoned for acquiring the property without licence. CPR 1330-34, 554.

¹⁶ CPR 1330-34, 554.

¹⁷ See CPR 1343-45, 8; C143/260/4; CPR 1350-54, 233; C143/307/2; CP40/371/189; CPR 1361-64, 272; C143/342/16.

¹⁸ CPR 1361-64, 520.

of the tenants had attorned to Kirkton during Dryby's lifetime.¹⁹ Later, in Michaelmas of the same year, Kirkton brought a suit against Ralph de Cromwell and his wife Matilda over the castle of Tattershall and the manor of Kirkby upon Bayne, Kirkton accusing the couple of unjustly disseising him of it.²⁰ However, Ralph and Maud claimed it as her inheritance as a descendant of Dryby, thereby rejecting the validity of the 1334 original grant. In the end, Kirkton's somewhat insubstantial claim was found wanting as Dryby's grant to him was judged to have been made only for his life.²¹ The Cromwells subsequently obtained hold of the manor upon Kirkton's death in 1367,²² remaining with his family into the fifteenth century.²³

Lands and rights resulting from marriages, then, could often be very problematic to a new man. Nonetheless, such cases were to be expected with any partition of land or diversion of an inheritance and would rarely remove all rights involved from the grantee. What was perhaps more disturbing for a new creation was when he found lands directly granted to him also being the subject of controversy and royal indecision. Grants from escheats were somewhat problematic in this respect. First of all, there could be

¹⁹ CPR 1361-64, 520.

²⁰ C260/77/no.1. The castle and manor of Tattershall was noted as being worth £20 per annum in 1343. C143/260/4.

²¹ C260/77/no. 1; CCR 1364-68, 322-23

²² CCR 1364-68, 322-23. Indeed, Dryby's grants to Kirkton do not seem to have been popular with the former's family. For another case started by a relative of Dryby, see CP40/331/187(ob).

²³ W. Douglas Simpson, ed., The Building Accounts of Tattershall Castle: 1434-1472 (1960), xii-xiii. That pursuits of a wife's rights could sometimes go to extremes may be seen in Nicholas Burnell's pursuit of the rent of a sparrow-hawk in right of his wife. See CPR 1361-64, 300.

difficulties getting the granted lands into the hands of the creation in the first place. Indeed, at least one grant seems to have had to have been repeated numerous times before the lands involved appear to have been secured. On 12 January 1339, Reginald de Cobham was granted for life "in consideration of good service in divers part and for the better support of the estate of banneret which he has received from the king" the king's mills "beneath" the castle of Oxford with the meadow there called 'Kyngesmede', which had been held by Thomas de Poynings, presumably for life, and which had upon his death come back into the king's hands.²⁴ It was again granted in October of 1339, but was later vacated.²⁵ By February of 1340, the mills had still not been delivered to Cobham, and orders to the escheator south of Trent and the sheriff of Oxford to do so.²⁶ Finally, in April of 1340, over a year after the original grant, the lands were again listed as being granted to Thomas, though this time it seems to have stuck.

However, even when escheated lands or rights did make it to the creation, this was by no means a guarantee that they would remain with him any length of time. Sometimes, simple administrative adjustments could be the cause of problems. In September of 1332, Roger de Swynnerton was granted for life the hundred of Pirhull (Staffordshire) "so that he keep it according to the statute published therein at Lincoln by the common council of the realm".²⁷ This clause seems to have had

²⁴ CPR 1338-40, 377.

²⁵ CPR 1338-40, 349.

²⁶ CCR 1339-41, 346.

²⁷ CFR 1327-37, 329.

a detrimental effect on his control of the hundred, because he appears to have later lost control of it "by pretext of an agreement made by the king and council touching the rejoining to their counties of hundreds of old annexed thereto and granted by Edward II", though in 1334 he again regained control of the land.²⁸ However, in September of the same year, the letters patent of the land were again revoked, and granted to Robert de Sapy, who seems to have held them by letters patent in the reign of Edward II.²⁹ The hundred seems to have gone through one more change of ownership, as it is noted as being back in Swynnerton's possession upon his death in 1338.³⁰

But even when such grants had been in the hands of a new creation for a number of years, they were often still far from secure. On 1 March 1344, the justices of the king's bench were ordered not to place Walter Manny in default for nonappearance in a court case against John, son of Richard de Grey of Codnor concerning the manor of Overstone (Northamptonshire), due to the fact that he was in royal service at that time.³¹ Later on in the decade, the case seems to have been resumed in the court of Common Pleas.³² It seems that Manny had originally been granted the manor in 1335 in recompense for the manors of Stiffkey and Holkham (Norfolk) which had been granted to him by the forfeiture of the estate of David de Strathbolgi, earl of Atholl, but which

²⁸ CFR 1327-37, 412.

²⁹ CFR 1319-27, 29; CFR 1327-37, 416.

³⁰ CFR 1337-47, 74.

³¹ CCR 1343-46, 475.

³² See Appendix 7. CP40/354/362(ob)

afterwards he was made to give back to the earl.³³ Grey sought this 'replacement' manor against Manny, claiming it as his right and inheritance, and that it had been unjustly taken from his grandfather, who, according to Grey, had held it from Henry III's time. And, even though the grant was obviously not very secure - as witness the proviso that "if he be impleaded in respect of this manor and lose it in this way or any other he shall receive compensation",³⁴ - Manny, in this instance, did eventually win the case, as in February of 1368, he was noted as arranging for the manor to be regranted in tail male to him.³⁵

But though the tally of court cases connected with all these sources mounted as the reign wore on, they were nonetheless well within the king's right and powers to grant out. Control of wardships, marriages and escheats were all firmly part of the king's feudal rights, and therefore open to little debate - though how such rights were exercised could, as has been seen, be very contentious. But expectancies and forfeitures, the two sources which made up a substantial portion of Edward's patronage programme, though within the king's rights to grant out, were, by nature, less well defined and therefore far less secure. Expectancies were obviously a less satisfactory source of grant to a creation - the often considerable period between grant and seisin allowing any number of claims, petitions and lawsuits to be

³³ CPR 1334-38, 176.

³⁴ That this was close to the king's heart is evidenced by the fact that it was sealed with the secret seal. CPR 1334-38, 176.

³⁵ CPR 1367-70, 92.

initiated.³⁶ For instance, on 13 May 1340 Reginald Cobham was granted in fee the reversion of the manor of Strood (Kent), which was held for life by Mary, countess of Pembroke, "in recompense for lands taken back into his hands".³⁷ However, on 20 May 1342, the grant was revoked as it was found that the grant to the countess of Pembroke had been made in fee.³⁸

Indeed, due to the delay in their fulfilment, expectancies seem to have been among the most contested of all types of grants. Bannerets often seem to have had the most trouble holding on to lands granted in this way. On 26 July 1333, Thomas Bradeston was granted the manor of Knolle by Bristol, held by William Dovyll, in expectancy. This was originally granted as a result of the forfeiture of Thomas de Gournaye.³⁹ However, later, in the mid 1330's, the widow of de Gournaye, Joan, won back the manor from Bradeston, and the king had to grant him other lands in its stead.⁴⁰ Again in the case of Bradeston, on 4 April 1340, he was granted in fee, "in part satisfaction of the promise of 500 marks yearly of land to support his estate of banneret", the reversion of the castle and manor of Llanfair and the land and lordship of Builth Wells in South Wales.⁴¹ This was held for life by Alice, countess of Lincoln, and was extended at £56. 14s. 4d. yearly as appears by an extent made by Gilbert Talbot, justice of South Wales. However, there is some evidence of a dispute over this grant, as on 10 March 1340, an

³⁶ This problem has been discussed in part on pp. 61-63.

³⁷ CPR 1338-40, 511.

³⁸ CPR 1340-43, 461.

³⁹ CPR 1330-34, 457. CCharR 1327-41, 305.

⁴⁰ CPR 1334-38, 562; Appendix 2.

⁴¹ CPR 1338-40, 448.

exemplification of letters patent - always a good indicator that someone was questioning the rights to a piece of land - was enrolled in the Patent Rolls.⁴² Though he managed to hold on to the right to the expectancy for ten years, after that, on 1 February 1350, he was granted in its place "the £84. 15d. yearly out of the farms which he renders yearly at the exchequer for the castle and town of Gloucester".⁴³

As a further illustration of the problem that such a grant could cause, in one case, three new men went to battle in court over the same expectancy. Robert de Benhale and Eva, his wife, sought the manor of Benhall against Robert de Ufford, earl of Suffolk in the court of Common Pleas in the Trinity term of 1351.⁴⁴ The couple claimed that it ought to revert to them since Guy de Ferre, who held it of John Clavering, the late husband of Eva, had died without heir. Ufford, however, claimed the reversion as his right through a grant of the king after the death of Eleanor Ferre and entered upon the land thereon.⁴⁵ In the same term, moreover, John de Norwich also brought a suit against Ufford over the manor, this time claiming that Guy de Ferre held the property of one Walter de Norwich, to whom John was the heir.⁴⁶ In both cases, Ufford, one of the king's close favourites, seems

⁴² CPR 1340-43, 390.

⁴³ CPR 1338-40, 448; CPR 1348-50, 461. E208/4/part4/22 Edward III/23. This property had had a colourful history prior to the time when Bradeston was granted the expectancy, being a notably difficult piece of land to control. For a brief history of the lordship from the time of its confiscation in 1322 as a result of the forfeiture of Humphrey to Bohun until the grant to Bradeston, see W. Rees, ed., Calendar of Ancient Petitions Relating to Wales (1975), 351.

⁴⁴ See Appendix 7. CP40/366/112.

⁴⁵ CPR 1338-40, 265.

⁴⁶ CP40/366/112(ob)

to have ended up the winner, as he died seised of the manor in 1369.⁴⁷

Grants of expectancies, then, tended to be contentious because of the nature of the grant. Grants of forfeitures, however, were contentious because of the source.⁴⁸ This was especially true concerning grants made directly from the forfeited lands of the last reign. Grants from land involuntarily surrendered were often hotly contested, not only by the original owners or their descendants, but also by any others who had claims upon the lands involved. The manor of Marston Meysy in Wiltshire is an illustration of this point.⁴⁹ Originally held by John de Meysy in the reign of Edward I, in 1305 or 1306, Hugh Despenser the elder forcibly disseised him from the manor and apparently imprisoned him until he signed it over. Meysy then sought a writ of novel disseisin against Despenser, which he pursued without success, except insofar as to get Despenser angry enough to name Meysy as one of the 1322 rebels. As a result, Meysy abjured the realm, but appears to have come back after Despenser's fall and regained hold of the manor. In 1330, he granted the manor to a group of feoffees who then granted it back to him, with remainder to Peter le Veel and Cecily, his wife, "the heirs of their bodies, and the right heirs of Peter".⁵⁰ However, when Edward III took control, the manor was taken back into the king's hand as part of the forfeiture

⁴⁷ CIPM xii, 410.

⁴⁸ See also Chapter Two on the changes taking place in the definition and scope of this right. See above, pp. 36-53.

⁴⁹ Except where noted, the following is from CP40/360/94 ff.

⁵⁰ C.R. Elrington, Abstracts of Feet of Fines Relating to Wiltshire for the Reign of Edward III (Wiltshire Record Society, vol 29, 1973), 23.

of Despenser and granted to John Darcy, first as a simple appointment during royal pleasure, then for his life, and in 1338 for the life of his son.⁵¹ There appears to have been no major dispute concerning the manor in Darcy's lifetime, but after his death, an action was started in October of 1350 by the designated heir of John de Meysy, the son of Peter de Veel, who claimed right of the manor through the aforementioned fine which gave him control of the manor after the death of Meysy.⁵²

Indeed, grants of forfeitures seem to have been very susceptible to counter-claims. In the case of the grant of Marston Meysy to Darcy, there was a proviso in this particular grant expecting problems, namely that if "these manors or any parcel thereof be at any time recovered against the said John by judgement of the king's court, he shall receive an equivalent".⁵³ Similarly, on 20 March 1344, Guy Brian was granted during pleasure the keeping of the manor of Stoke Trister (Somerset), giving £40 a year for it to the chamber.⁵⁴ This was later, in October of 1344, granted for a period of seven years.⁵⁵ However, in September of 1345, Brian was forced to give up the manor to John Molyns, who seems to

⁵¹ This, and the manor of Wyke Valors by Mershton Meysy, were granted to Darcy in as a replacement for £16 of rent in Ormesby (Norfolk), and the manors of Brocklesby and Gretham (Lincolnshire). CPR 1330-34, 165, 268. For the grant to his son, see CPR 1338-40, 16.

⁵² CP40/360/94 ff. For another example of the confusion over ownership caused by the forfeiture and redistribution of the Despenser estate, see Adam de Moldworth's suit to regain control of the manor of Little Barrow, which Edward III had granted to Roger de Swynnerton but which Moldworth claimed was his through an agreement with Hugh Despenser the elder. KB27/301/48.

⁵³ CPR 1330-34, 268.

⁵⁴ CFR 1337-47, 378.

⁵⁵ CFR 1337-47, 394.

have held it previously.⁵⁶ Of the forfeited lands of John de Marshal's and John de Segrave's estates, which had been granted to Cobham, Brian and Manny, both estates were given back to their original owners within two years of being granted. Notably these disputes were settled fairly quickly. On other occasions, the matter was more drawn out. One of the longest running land disputes connected with Edward III's endowment programme was over the commote of Is Cennan including the castle of Carreg Cennan (Carmarthenshire).⁵⁷ This lordship had come into Edward I's hands in the early 1280's as a result of his conquest of Wales and was then granted to John Giffard of Brimpsfield in 1283,⁵⁸ though not without considerable opposition from the Earl of Hereford.⁵⁹ Nonetheless, the Giffard family retained hold of it until 1322, when John Giffard forfeited his lands for siding with the Contrarians.⁶⁰ Edward II then granted them to Hugh Despenser the younger, and, according to Davies, it was during his tenure that it gained the "virtual status of a Marcher lordship".⁶¹ Despenser's fall in 1326 and the coronation of Edward III in the next year resulted in the commote being granted, as part of the estate of John de

⁵⁶ CCR 1343-46, 605.

⁵⁷ R.R. Davies, Conquest, Coexistence, and Change: Wales 1063-1415 (1987), 337. It was worth, when held of the Duchy of Lancaster in the last quarter of the century, £138 per annum. R.R. Davies, Lordship and Society in the March of Wales: 1282-1400 (1978), 196-98.

⁵⁸ KB27/313/24.

⁵⁹ Davies, Lordship and Society, 37. Hereford claimed that Is Cennan ought to have come to him as a result of his conquest of Vychans. A case in 1284 went in Giffard's favour, though Hereford was still claiming it as late as 1289. J. E. Morris, The Welsh Wars of Edward I (1901), 206, 222.

⁶⁰ Davies, Lordship and Society, 48.

⁶¹ Davies, Lordship and Society, 280, 300, 304.

Giffard and his wife Aveline, to John de Maltravers in 4 October 1327 to hold for as long as it remained within the king's custody.⁶² In November of 1328, the castle was also granted to him,⁶³ and on 22 March 1329, Maltravers was granted all the Giffard lands to himself and his heirs, though by the wording of the charter, there still seems to be a great deal of ambiguity as to whether the lands should be in the king's hands in the first place.⁶⁴ In May of 1330, one John de Caillewe released to Maltravers all lands of John de Giffard of which he had rights and was granted licence to enfeoff Maltravers with the castle.⁶⁵ It then forfeited after his disgrace in 1331, and next appears as a grant of the property's farm for life to Maurice de Berkeley in November of 1334.⁶⁶ On 18 December 1337, however, Berkeley was persuaded to part with the land in exchange for the grant of other Giffard lands, and the lands were then granted to John de Wilington, Ralph, his son, and Eleanor his wife and the heirs of Ralph's body as well as a grant of the dower portion of Giffard's wife's lands, namely the manor of Broghton (Wiltshire), and Eliston and Orcheston.⁶⁷ This piece of land, then, was essentially moving from one Gloucestershire peer to another, depending upon the political environment of the day. But none of the individuals mentioned thus far appear to have

⁶² CPR 1327-37, 65. Maltravers had had connections with the Giffard family prior to the 1322 rebellion, and both men took part in the civil war, as well as Elias Giffard having married Maltravers' sister, Alice, before October of 1327. CPR 1321-24, 40; CCR 1318-23, 483; CCR 1327-30, 171.

⁶³ CPR 1327-37, 113.

⁶⁴ CCharR 1327-41, 116-17.

⁶⁵ CPR 1327-30, 527; CCR 1330-33, 140; see also C47/59/3/75. Substantial mention of this fine is also made in KB27/366/73.

⁶⁶ CPR 1334-38, 42, 563-64; CPR 1327-37, 423.

⁶⁷ CPR 1334-38, 561-64.

made any real opposition to the way in which the lands moved. However, almost immediately after the 1337 grant, and throughout the next few years, there ran a court case over the ultimate ownership of the property. The case seems to have started in earnest in the Trinity Session of the Court of King's Bench in 1338.⁶⁸ Though Giffard's widow, Margaret, also brought actions over the lands against the Wilingtons,⁶⁹ the main contender against their ownership of the lands was Gilbert Talbot, justice of South Wales, keeper of Carmarthen Castle and another of Edward's new peerage creations. Talbot claimed that the right to the property was his through one Llywelyn ap Rhys Vaghan, 'consangineus', living in the time of Edward I, and therefore probably connected with the pre-Edwardian ownership of the commote. Gilbert claimed that Llywelyn had not forfeited but had in fact died seised of the lands in question and that therefore, after his death, by right his estate should have reverted to his aunt Wenthave sister of Rhys, his father, then to her son Richard, and then to Gilbert himself. The elder Wilington, however, died in 1338, and the lands and connected court case were inherited by his son, Ralph. Perhaps due to the problematic nature of the grant, in 1340 Ralph decided to enfeoff Carreg Cennan and Is Cennan to the earl of Derby, a man obviously more able to control the grant.⁷⁰

⁶⁸ KB27/313/23; continued Michaelmas term 1339 CP40/320/448(ob). See Appendix 7.

⁶⁹ CP40/316/1. See also KB27/314/26, CP40/341/132(ob) and SC8/192/9556 for more of the case.

⁷⁰ The Wilington family still seems to have had ultimate right to this land at least until 1345 as Gilbert Talbot was noted as petitioning the king over a court case concerning the property. CPR 1338-40, 549; CCR 1343-46, 582; Rees, ed., Ancient Petitions Relating to Wales, 319. See also Fowler,

Grants from forfeitures as a result of the war seem to have been similarly insecure, though rarely would such cases have shown up in the central courts - rather any land transfer would have been decided directly by the king.⁷¹ Nonetheless, in the case of secular forfeitures it seems to have been accepted that the lands forfeited as a result of the French war would most likely be returned, as when William Montagu was granted the manor of Martok (Somerset) late of John de Fienles, a vassal of the French king, on conditional terms.⁷² Nor were forfeited lands connected with the Scottish lands secure on this point - even discounting forcible ejection by the Scots. In the case of the Earl of Atholl's lands, in October of the same year, the king restored the earl his lands, and Manny was granted in its stead the manor of Overstone (Northamptonshire), with the notable provisos that if "he be impleaded in respect of this manor and lose it in this or any other way, he shall receive compensation".⁷³

Considering expectancies and forfeitures made up a considerable amount of Edward's long term patronage to his new creations, this was obviously a disturbing trend. But more importantly, that any such patronage - escheat, expectancy, or forfeiture - could be overturned when a creation died and a less favoured son took his place was even more worrying. The court cases in which the heirs of John

King's Lieutenant, 172; R. Somerville, History of the Duchy of Lancaster (1953-70), 39.

⁷¹ Which, considering forfeiture for war often did not originate in the king's court in the first place, was quite logical. See above, p. 44.

⁷² CFR 1337-47, 43. Though this land was later granted to Montagu in fee on 6 March 1340. CPR 1338-40, 434.

⁷³ CPR 1334-38, 176.

Darcy and John Wilington participated, as noted above, stand as examples of this, though perhaps the outstanding example is the plight of William Montagu, second earl of Salisbury. William Montagu senior, as we have seen, was a great favourite of Edward III, having been a leader of the 1330 coup and one of his great war captains. However, upon his death in 1344, Edward seems to have taken a far more ambivalent attitude to his son. As a result, in the course of the second earl of Salisbury's lifetime, the family lost a considerable amount of the gains which the elder Montagu had made through Edward III's favour - including the honour of Denbigh, Sherborne castle (Wiltshire) and the lands connected with the Warenne inheritance. The Mortimer lands were particularly problematic in this respect. As mentioned previously, the estate, forfeited after the 1330 coup, originally was a boon for Edward's peers. These were then subject to a number of lawsuits, one of the most conspicuous being over the honour of Denbigh. Denbigh was again one of the lordships conquered by Edward I in the early 1280's, being originally granted to Henry Lacy, earl of Lincoln.⁷⁴ It was then held by the Lacy family until 1311 when the line failed. Alice, the daughter of Henry earl of Lincoln then married Thomas Earl of Lancaster and the lands passed into the Lancastrian hands. However, in 1322, the lordship came into the king's hands as a result of Lancaster's forfeiture, and threats by the Despensers against Lancaster's wife further diverted it to the elder Despenser's hand.⁷⁵ After

⁷⁴ Davies, Lordship and Society, 27.

⁷⁵ Fryde, Tyranny and Fall, 113.

Despenser's fall, it was granted to Mortimer, who in turn held it until he fell in 1330. It was then granted to William Montagu in 1331 as a sign of favour for his aid in the overthrow of Mortimer, being worth at the time in the neighbourhood of £1000 per annum, though he ended up having to pay substantial sums to secure the title to members of those families who had held the lands over the last half century - most notably to Alice de Lacy, Countess of Lincoln, the son of Hugh Despenser the younger and to Hugh the elder's widow, Eleanor, and her husband, William de la Zouche.⁷⁶ As Davies notes, this, along with further purchases in the area,⁷⁷ made Montagu into one of the more substantial Marcher lords. However, as has been often noted, a king's preference for a man did not necessarily extend to his offspring, so that when the judgement against Roger Mortimer was reversed in the autumn of 1354,⁷⁸ his estate was again open season for his heirs. Mortimer asserted in the Hilary session of King's Bench in 1354 that William Montagu, the second earl of Salisbury had illegally entered into the lordship of Denbigh and unjustly held it.⁷⁹ Both men then showed up to court in person, emphasizing the importance of the case. The earl of Salisbury did not recognise the hold of the earl of March and said that his father had been granted Denbigh and the

⁷⁶ C47/10/35(8); Davies, Lordship and Society, 50; for a discussion of the Denbigh grant, see p. 41.

⁷⁷ Especially the reversion of the Montalt inheritance from the queen mother. Davies, Lordship and Society, 50.

⁷⁸ See Bellamy, Law of Treason, 83-85.

⁷⁹ KB27/376/21. Earlier, in October of 1353, as a precursor to the battle, Montagu requested a patent to certify that he had done homage for the lordship of Denbigh. SC1/40/122. See also J.G. Edwards 'Calendar of Ancient Correspondence concerning Wales', Board of Celtic Studies (1935), 190-91.

cantreds of Ros, Reywynok and Kaermere and commote and Dynmael by the king. Mortimer, however claimed that since the disinheritance of his grandfather was erroneous, he should be reseised. Mortimer, probably as a result of his growing favour with Edward III, won the case, though there is evidence that Montagu was still trying to win back the lordship in 1359, 1377-80 and even as late as 1397.⁸⁰

But Mortimer lands were not the only properties which would cause problems for the younger Montagu. During the Minority, Montagu senior was granted the castle of Sherborne for life and a year later in 1331, this grant was made in fee.⁸¹ Indeed, questions over actual ownership of the castle between the king and the bishop of Salisbury seem to have dated back to the Anarchy.⁸² In May of 1354, this latest incarnation of this dispute, the bishop sought his right to the castle against the second earl of Salisbury as the right of his church of the Blessed Mary, Salisbury, through Jocelinus, bishop in the time of Richard I.⁸³ Both men appeared in person and decided to put forward champions for a trial by combat. Pledges were made and the date set, but on the day of the battle, though the Bishop of Salisbury came

⁸⁰ C47/10/35(8); SC1/38/106; RP iii, 7, 58-59; see also Holmes, Estates, 19, footnote 3. Others who gained from Mortimer's fall had similar experiences - such as John de Beauchamp, who lost the manor of Oddingley through a like argument of erroneous judgement against the elder Mortimer. See KB27/375/71. Others outside of Edward's new peerage suffered in a like way - for example, the Berkeley family. See KB27/376/20.

⁸¹ CPR 1327-30, 528; CCharR 1327-41, 210; CPR 1330-34, 54; RP ii, 56. In some ways, however, this was not as generous of the king as might be thought, as the castle had gone through a multitude of owners in the last decade and was desperately in need of repair. See CPR 1327-30, 563.

⁸² Pounds, Medieval Castle, 29, 31, 53.

⁸³ See Appendix 7. CP40/375/275.

with his champion, the earl withdrew, after which the bishop regained seisin for himself and his heirs.⁸⁴

Finally, Montagu the younger also seems to have had problems with many of the expectancies granted to his father. Probably one of the most important of such cases were the grants made to William Montagu upon becoming earl of Salisbury in 1337.⁸⁵ At this time he was granted a number of lands expectant on the demise of the earl of Surrey and his wife. Upon the death of Surrey in 1347, however, Henry of Lancaster launched a series of suits against the countess of Surrey over her husband's lands, including the reversions granted to Montagu and his heirs.⁸⁶ Claiming that his uncle, Thomas of Lancaster, had only demised them to Warenne alone, Henry claimed that the lands should have reverted to him through his father, the brother and heir of Thomas. The countess of Surrey, however, claimed that she held the lands involved for life as well, and put forth a charter given by the king in February of 1327 to that effect.⁸⁷ In 1348, an agreement was reached whereby Grosmont was to control all the manors connected with the inheritance save Aldbourne.⁸⁸

However, these lands ended up in the Countess Warenne's

⁸⁴ This was later secured by the bishop of Salisbury not only with a 500 mark payment to the king, but also with quite an elaborate agreement between Salisbury and the Bishop, in effect giving the former some form of compensation for his loss while at the same time attempting to make sure that he made no further claims on the property. See CCR 1354-60, 122, 180-82. See also Holmes, Estates, 29.

⁸⁵ See pp. 56-57.

⁸⁶ For the manors of Hanstrige and Charleton (Somerset), see CP40/359/43; for the manor of Canford, see CP40/359/43(ob); and for the manors Trowbridge, Winterburn, Amesbury and Aldbourne (Wiltshire), see CP40/359/46.

⁸⁷ CPR 1327-30, 35.

⁸⁸ For what follows, see Somerville, Duchy of Lancaster i, 35-36; Fairbank, 'Last Earl of Warrene and Surrey', 257-63.

hands, who leased them to the Black Prince. The latter returned them to the earl of Salisbury as his reversionary right on the countess's death in 1361. Though dispute seems to have continued concerning the manors into the 1360's with Lancaster's heir, Blanche, and her husband John of Gaunt, winning a court case over the matter in 1365, finally, by agreement, the couple gave up most of the lands to Salisbury.⁸⁹

Unsurprisingly, then, some creations tried to protect their lands against such occurrences as quickly and forcefully as possible. Both Robert Ufford and Henry of Grosmont participated in enfeoffments to use to this end. Ufford enfeoffed his brother, Peter de Ty and Adam de Scakelthorp of part of a manor and some rent in Combs (Suffolk),⁹⁰ while Grosmont was in 1349 given licence, apparently in connection with service in France, to grant £1000 per annum in lands and rents to unnamed persons for twelve years.⁹¹ Or jointure could be used to help protect properties. The entailed grant to Bohun in 1332 of the estate of the king's uncle, Thomas, earl of Norfolk, is such a case.⁹² In July of 1346 the king granted Bohun licence to enfeoff John, archbishop of Canterbury and others with the

⁸⁹ Except Trowbridge and Aldbourne. Somerville, Duchy of Lancaster i, 36; see also C260/106/8.

⁹⁰ CPR 1340-43, 502. It is sometimes difficult to decide from the text of a grant what was a straight demise and what was an enfeoffment to use. All the grants discussed in this chapter have been identified as enfeoffments to use by Bean. Bean, Decline of Feudalism, 117-18.

⁹¹ CPR 1348-50, 374. Grosmont also enfeoffed a considerable portion of his estate to the Bishop of Lincoln and the earl of Arundel, amongst others, just before he died. CPR 1358-61, 575-76, 580.

⁹² CPR 1330-34, 335.

lands so that he could then grant them in jointure to himself and his wife.⁹³ Similarly, Ralph Stafford and his wife had her part of the Clare estate made into a jointure tenancy in 1348.⁹⁴ Indeed, while such legal devices may not have made new men immune from court cases and the loss of lands - as a potential plaintiff could as easily take the feoffee or wife to court - they nonetheless did place one more stage between the new man and the original grant, and perhaps also lent more power to any claim to ownership simply by the number of others who would lose out if the outcome of the case was unfavourable.

Contemporary reaction, then, was also seen in the way the creations themselves acted towards royal favour. In many cases, as above, it was an attempt to protect a grant from covetous hands. But, perhaps as a result of the obviously contentious nature of many of the grants, especially those of escheats or forfeitures, a few of the creations also treated their royal patronage as a commodity, to be sold or otherwise exploited as quickly as possible in case they later lost them. Indeed, new creations sometimes treated even the temporary control of forfeitures as a way to turn a quick profit. For example, in February of 1349, Roger Beauchamp was granted, for the payment of the farm, the keeping of the manors of Aston on Carrant and Ashton (Gloucestershire), both of which were the possession of the alien abbot of Beaubec

⁹³ CPR 1345-48, 143. For mention of agreement over an enfeoffment to use of the manor of Deddington (Oxfordshire), see CP40/348/35.

⁹⁴ Along with the Corbet inheritance. CPR 1348-50, 19; CPR 1350-54, 67. Also see Holmes, Estates, 49.

and were confiscated as a result of the war with France.⁹⁵ Within a month, however, Roger had demised this land to one William Dale, the king having acknowledged the grant.⁹⁶ More commonly, long terms forfeiture grants were used in such a manner. In the case of the Maltravers' manor of Overstone discussed above, a further indenture in February of 1339 showed Cobham granting the manor to John de Molyns to hold for life of Cobham by a rent of £80.⁹⁷ Indeed, Molyns seems to have been a favoured tertiary recipient of royal patronage. In the same year, Walter Manny granted to him the manor of Beachington and the reversion of the manor of Chersley, both in Buckinghamshire and both of the estate of the earl of Atholl, with remainder to his sons and reversion to his right heirs.⁹⁸ Escheats could be treated in a similar way. The manor of Chippenham (Wiltshire), granted to Reginald de Cobham originally for life,⁹⁹ later in fee, out of the estate of the earl of Cornwall was, in early 1338, then granted by Cobham to Master John de Thoresby and John de Etton, and they granted it back to him for his life, with the remainder going to John de Molyns for life and John son of John de Molyns in tail male and to William, brother of John, son of John, in tail male, with reversion to the right heirs of John de Molyns.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁵ CFR 1347-56, 105.

⁹⁶ CFR 1347-56, 107.

⁹⁷ CPR 1338-40, 310-11

⁹⁸ CPR 1338-40, 409-10. Interestingly, these were both part of earl of Atholl's lands which had been granted to Manny at the time of his forfeiture and never returned when the earl regained favour. See Appendix 2.

⁹⁹ See above, p. 33.

¹⁰⁰ CPR 1338-40, 310-11

Another way to turn a profit was to roundly abuse these grants, the intention obviously being to get as much value out of them before they went back into the possession of the original owner. The keeping of alien priories were particularly susceptible on this account.¹⁰¹ In one case, that of the grant of the estate of the abbot and convent of Lyre to John Darcy, the abbot received back the lands by the grant of the king, as "the said lands, possessions and churches, with the manors, woods and other things pertaining thereto, are greatly deteriorated and almost destroyed by reason of the said farm and on account of their occupation by laymen".¹⁰²

And, at first glance, the more general contemporary reaction seems to reflect these sentiments. After all, this was the period when, as G.L. Harriss has made abundantly clear, the distinctions between royal and public spheres of finance were being worked out. Within this, the king's use of his feudal resources, along with finances granted by common assent, were bound to come up in the debate.¹⁰³ The parliamentary rolls make a number of mentions of what were perceived as royal misuse of sources of patronage. In 1339, it was requested by the peerage in parliament that wardships be given to the next of kin -¹⁰⁴ something perhaps

¹⁰¹ See also the section on alien priories in Chapter Two. See pp. 47-49.

¹⁰² It had become royal policy to grant back to aliens their lands provided they were able to render the proper amount for the farm of the lands. CFR 1347-56, 427-28.

¹⁰³ See Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, 149-59.

¹⁰⁴ RP ii, 104a.

unsurprising considering the number of wardships given out to Edward's new men prior to that time.¹⁰⁵ Next, during the crisis of 1340-41, claims were made to control the use of royal feudal rights, namely that in exchange for the grant of a ninth, Edward III promised that

all profits arising from the said Aid (ie. the ninth), and of Wards and Marriages, Customs and Escheats, and other profits rising of the said Realm of England, shall be put and spent upon the Maintenance and the Safeguard of our Realm of England, and in our Wars in Scotland, France, and Gascoign, and in no places elsewhere during the said Wars.¹⁰⁶

Unsurprisingly, the rhetoric in use at this time has been seen by many historians as having echoed the Ordainer's demands in Edward II's reign.¹⁰⁷ In 1343, a more general request was made by the commons that all lands, rents, escheats and other royal profits be held on to by the king in order to maintain himself, fund the war and "other great matters of the realm".¹⁰⁸ At the end of the reign, this request was again made by the commons in the Good Parliament of 1376.¹⁰⁹ Finally, early in the next reign, royal use of annuities was examined, the idea seeming to be that Edward III had not left enough of the crown revenues to maintain the king's estate,¹¹⁰ which again turned into a more general examination of Edward's use of royal patronage sources.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁵ See Appendix 4.

¹⁰⁶ S.R. i, 289-90.

¹⁰⁷ Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, 300-01; Ormrod, Edward III, 15.

¹⁰⁸ RP ii, 141.

¹⁰⁹ RP ii, 356a.

¹¹⁰ RP iii, 16b, 35b.

¹¹¹ RP iii, 57a, 74b.

Indeed, according to Harriss, "the crisis of 1340 produced the clearest statement of the view that such [feudal] revenue pertained to the crown".¹¹² But one must be careful about equating the rhetoric surrounding specific crises, especially that of 1340-41, with more endemic criticism of Edward III's elevation and endowment programme. Aside from the fact that this rhetoric was part of a line of debate which stretched back into the last century, and therefore not specific to Edward III's reign,¹¹³ all bouts of parliamentary criticism have two things in common. Firstly, they all come at times when the country is under considerable financial and political stress.¹¹⁴ Whether in the early 1340's, at the height of Edward's exactions for the first phase of the Hundred Years War, or in the turbulence of the late 1370's when not only the downturn in fortunes in France, but also domestic discontent at home - as well as the death of one king, and the minority of another - in each instance the kingdom in a very delicate state. It is unsurprising then that parliament hit upon whatever it saw as unnecessary expenditure as a way to decrease the burden on its members. This is not to say that such censure was not important, or for that matter, valid - only that they can not be said to have arisen as criticisms in and of themselves of royal

¹¹² Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, 155.

¹¹³ See Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, 160-85. It should, moreover, be noted that the Ordinances of 1311 were referred to throughout the period, whenever critics called for reform of the government. For example, see RP ii, 7, 11. Wilkinson, moreover, saw the similarities between 1311 and 1341 as having "perhaps been pressed a little too far". B. Wilkinson, 'The Protest of the Earls of Arundel and Surrey in the Crisis of 1341', EHR xxxvii (1931), 191.

¹¹⁴ See also Wolffe, Royal Demesne, 73-75.

patronage policy, but more as a "knee jerk" reaction to more general demands for economy. It is, indeed, notable that there was little such recorded reaction up until the late 1330's, namely before the period of financial stress had really set in, or after the mid 1340's, when the war had again begun to go well. And, while other criticisms, such as the use of direct or indirect taxation for the financing of the war effort, were criticized throughout the period, it is notable that only when the debate hit a fever pitch in the early 1340's did royal patronage really come into the picture as an issue for debate.¹¹⁵

Secondly, and more importantly for this discussion, though criticism of Edward's policies was more than evident throughout the reign, seldom in the parliaments of the reign were Edward's new men a particular focus of criticism concerning his use of patronage. Aside from criticisms of the conduct of the war, which applied to anyone fighting in France,¹¹⁶ the closest anyone ever comes to criticizing the actual elevation and endowment of the new men was when the earl of Surrey, noting the presence of John Darcy and Ralph Stafford, among others, in the parliament of 1341, questions:

'Sir king, how goes this parliament?
Parliaments were not wont to be like this.
For here those who should be foremost are
shut out, while there sit other men of low
rank who have no business to be here. Such

¹¹⁵ See Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, 231 ff.

¹¹⁶ Both old and new nobility. For instance, though not too heavy with the old titled nobility, the 1338-39 campaign in France did include, aside from the bishop of Lincoln, Geoffrey le Scrope, John de Montgomery, John de Segrave, John de Faucomberg and many others who had been ennobled prior to 1330. The Wardrobe Book of William de Norwell: 12 July 1338 to 27 May 1340 eds. M. Lyon, B. Lyon and H.S. Lucas, and J. de Sturler (1983), 325-62.

right belongs only to the peers of the land.
 Sir king, think of this.¹¹⁷

This, indeed, was a pointed criticism, and one which must be taken as an indictment of Edward's choice of favourites as well as, presumably, his use of patronage. But this was the only instance of such a criticism of any of Edward's new men as such in a reign which lasted five decades. Whereas in previous or subsequent reigns, when the subject of the abuse of royal patronage had come up, individual examples were freely and constantly given in connection with Edward II's favourites as Richard II's - so much so that the infamy of a Gaveston, Despenser or de la Pole threatened to eclipse the reputation of the kings they were said to serve - the reaction to Edward's new men, while never completely mute, can hardly have been said to have threatened to cause outright rebellion as these men had.¹¹⁸ Rather criticism, when it came, tended to come at the more theoretical level of the working out of how feudal causalities were to be used.¹¹⁹ In other words, when Edward III was criticised for his use of patronage during the reign, aside from the instance noted above, it does not seem to have been because he targeted the wrong people for reward, but rather that he used such

¹¹⁷ Croniques de London ed. G.J. Aungier (CS, 1844) 90. As translated by Tout, Chapters, iii, 131.

¹¹⁸ And, it must be said, in much shorter order. Whereas Piers de Gaveston, the Despensers, and Michael de la Pole all caused reaction within a few years of their rise, four of the most important of Edward III's new men - namely William Montagu, Robert Ufford, William Bohun, and William Clinton - all survived the best part of a decade, until the crisis of 1340-41, often compiling large estates, yet rarely being the target of communal disapproval.

¹¹⁹ See Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, 155. Indeed, if the disaffected parts of parliament were really out to get Edward's new men, the use of tenths and fifteenths to pay annuities to them could easily have been dredged up as an abuse of communally granted revenues. See Appendix 5b.

patronage at all instead of the more laudable goal, at least in the Commons' eyes,¹²⁰ of keeping it to "help maintain the household or the King's wars".¹²¹ This, then, was obviously a problem which had not simply arisen during the reign, but was more symptomatic of the more general changes in the ideas and realities of public finance in the later Middle Ages.

Indeed, had there been continual opposition to Edward's choice and reward of new men throughout the reign, it would surely have found voice in the chroniclers of the time - often among the keenest of royal critics. However, most chronicles simply mention the creation of the 1337 earls,¹²² or at best refer to the characters and prowess of the new men, usually in connection with the war in France.¹²³ Indeed, considering the publicity around the 1337 creations, as well as the sheer number of men whom Edward raised to the peerage and endowed to various degrees, especially after 1341,¹²⁴

¹²⁰ Indeed, it should be noted that, aside from the 1339 petition concerning wardships, all the criticisms of royal patronage appear to have come from the Commons, and that, at least in the case of the 1340 petition, the backing of the Lords was not evident. This was probably because, as Harriss notes, "Edward's distribution of patronage had been so liberal and eclectic and the magnates stood only to lose from a resumption [of lands and grants]". Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, 264-65.

¹²¹ Harriss, King, Parliament and Public Finance, 155.

¹²² For example, Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis, (RS 1882), viii, 332; Adae Murimuth Continuatio Chronicarum, (RS 1889), 78-79. For a listing of the chronicles dealing with Edward's reign, see A. Grandsen, Historical Writing in England vol. ii c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century, (1982), 499-500.

¹²³ For example, in a passage about the campaign in France prior to Crecy, the Chandos Herald refers to the earl of Northampton as a "right noble person," the earl of Suffolk as having a heart "hardy and brave", and Cobham and Brian being "valiant" and "good" respectively. Chandos Herald, The Life and Feats of Arms of Edward, the Black Prince, Francisque-Michel, trans (1883), 8-9.

¹²⁴ See Appendix 1.

the fact that, of the chroniclers, only one saw fit to level any sort of criticism against Edward on this score seems quite surprising. Sir Thomas Gray, in his Scalacronica, was the only contemporary chronicler to criticise Edward III's use of patronage to his new men:

Upon which earls and other good men of his the King bestowed so liberally of his possessions that he retained for himself scarcely any of the lands appertaining to the Crown, but was obliged to subsist upon levies and subsidies, which were a heavy burden on the people.¹²⁵

This does, it seems, echo the ideas of the parliamentary rolls that 'the king should live of his own'. But again, even Gray's work has a heavy slant, influenced by the environment in which he was working. Indeed, his chronicle may be seen from the viewpoint of a man lying languishing as a prisoner in Edinburgh castle for lack of anyone to pay the ransom, one who also thought the Scottish war more important than the French, and therefore one likely to look at those who left him there in less than favourable light.¹²⁶ Finally, even Gray does not question the focus of the patronage, rather its use at all at a time of national need.¹²⁷

The overall lack of negative feeling towards Edward's new men, especially once the war began to go well, was also shown

¹²⁵ T. Gray, Scalacronica: The Reigns of Edward I, Edward II and Edward III, H. Maxwell, trans. (1907), 102.

¹²⁶ Scalacronica, vii-viii.

¹²⁷ Similarly, the political tract "Against the king's taxes", believed to be composed around 1338, though criticizing all and sundry concerning the harshness of the king's exactions, made no pointed criticisms of patronage to those newly risen - even though their annuities were sometimes being paid through tenths and fifteenths at this time. Anglo-Norman Political Songs ed. by I.S.T. Aspin, (1953), 105-15; Appendix 5b.

in their acceptance by the ruling class. Sometimes, evidence of this would manifest itself through acts of token favour, as when the Black Prince gave two tuns of wine to John de Beauchamp,¹²⁸ along with a "cloth of 'Turkie'",¹²⁹ "furs and long cloth", ¹³⁰ and, on one occasion, "the best mare in the park of Risbergh at his choice, except the prince's grey mare there".¹³¹ On the other hand, more substantial reward could also indicate acceptance. Walter Manny, for example, was appointed Marshal of the King's Marshalsea, by the earl of Norfolk,¹³² as was Roger Beauchamp to the custodianship of Devizes castle in 1340 by Queen Philippa.¹³³

Moreover, this acceptance was also reflected in the willingness of all sectors of the ruling class to do business with Edward's new creations. Often, with the royal family this took the form of leases of lands to certain creations. There was a note made in an entry in the Inquisitions Miscellaneous of the manor of Banstead, previously held by

¹²⁸ BPR iv, 53.

¹²⁹ BPR iv, 67.

¹³⁰ BPR iv, 227.

¹³¹ BPR iv, 113. This system, however, could also work in reverse, the show of favour by a member of the royal family being the precursor to favour by the king - as when Richard Stafford was raised to the peerage after he had been given a 200 mark annuity, and later land grants, by the Black Prince. CPR 1358-61, 303; Appendix 1.

¹³² G.E.C. viii, 572. Earlier, in 1331, Norfolk had granted Manny a fee of 35 marks per annum "out of the fee which the earl receives from the county of Norfolk". CPR 1330-34, 96. The earl of Norfolk also obtained a licence to grant to William Montagu for life the county of Carlow and all his castles, islands, manors, towns and lands in Ireland, and the manor of Hampstead Marshall (Berkshire) with all connected rights, with the proviso that if Montagu died within fifteen years, the lands would go to his executors and assigns until the end of that term, and then to Norfolk's heirs. CPR 1330-34, 402.

¹³³ CPR 1340-43, 115; CPR 1343-45, 270. Philippa was later to make Beauchamp her steward. Given-Wilson, 'Court and Household of Edward III', 175.

Queen Isabella and granted on the latter's fall from grace to Queen Philippa, being granted for a two year term to one of Edward's new creations, Thomas de Bradeston.¹³⁴ Queen Philippa also was involved in another land transaction with one of Edward's new men, when, in 1355, she granted licence for John Beauchamp to purchase the manor of Silham, held of her in chief of her manor of Middleton (Kent) with the further proviso that he would also retain the manor after the death of the queen from the king.¹³⁵ In another case, on 24 July 1337, there was confirmation of a life grant by Queen Philippa to John Verdon of the keeping of the castle of Rockingham and the stewardship "of the forest between the bridges of Oxford and Stafford". This was held by Philippa of Edward's gift, and which would be held by Verdon at a rent of £80 a year.¹³⁶ In 1342, Henry of Grosmont leased the honor of Pontefract back from Philippa for £1000 per annum,¹³⁷ and, in 1345, she leased to William Clinton the manor of Middleton (Kent) for £220.¹³⁸ Even the old queen, Isabella, was not above doing business with Edward's new peers, namely William Montagu, the key man in her lover, Roger Mortimer's,

¹³⁴ CIM 1307-48, 371.

¹³⁵ CPR 1354-58, 186. In the mid 1340's she also let to farm to Beauchamp, by a bond of £300, and at a rate of £130 a year, the castle of Southampton, and the manor and park of Lyndhurst with the New Forest (Hampshire) and the hundred of Redbridge and 40s of rent paid by the abbot and convent of Reading for a tenement in the New Forest. CPR 1343-45, 235; CCR 1343-46, 250.

¹³⁶ CFR 1337-47, 26.

¹³⁷ Somerville, History of the Duchy of Lancaster i, 35.

¹³⁸ CPR 1343-45, 442. This list of Philippa's land transactions with Edward's new creations continued into the 1360's with the sale by the queen to Michael de Poynings of the wardship of the body of one William, son and heir of Sir John de Bardolf, for £1000. CCR 1364-68, 262-63, CPR 1364-67, 224.

downfall. On 1 October 1337, Montagu was granted the reversion of a number of Queen Isabella's lands.¹³⁹ It appears that, though in part an act of patronage by the king, this was also the result of an exchange by Isabella of 600 marks out of the coinage for tin in the county of Chester which William had been granted until his 1337 reversions came in.¹⁴⁰

From the nonroyal nobility, however, the acceptance of a new man was more likely to be seen in his part in the enfeoffment to use - obviously a position of trust as any landholder would not wish to put legal control of his property in the hands of someone he did not believe worthy. For instance, in 1361 Ralph Basset, one of the victors of Crecy, was noted as being part of a group enfeoffment made by the earl of Warwick of the castle and shrievalty of Worcester and other manors, lands and rights spread throughout Worcestershire, Warwickshire, Gloucestershire, Hampshire, Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, Rutland and the March of Wales - a considerable trust for one yet to be raised to the peerage.¹⁴¹ Similarly, in November of 1374 both Richard le Scrope and Roger Beauchamp were feoffees to Edmund de

¹³⁹ CCharR 1327-41, 431-33; CCR 1337-9, 273; see also pp. 62-63.

¹⁴⁰ CPR 1334-38, 114, 115.

¹⁴¹ CPR 1361-64, 48. It should be noted, moreover, that even witnessing such an agreement was in essence being placed in a position of trust. Indeed, if any problem later came up as to who held rightful title to the land, especially when legal hold had been transferred to enfeoffees, such an individual would be of crucial importance in establishing the right of the original owner. For an example of one of Edward's new men acting in such a capacity in an enfeoffment to use of a member of the established nobility, see Walter de Manny's part in the 1369 enfeoffment to use of the earl of Pembroke of the lordship of Abergavenny to a group of feoffees. CPR 1374-77, 72, 78.

Mortimer for a considerable estate in the West Midlands and Wales including the castle, manor and town of Ludlow as well as a number of lordships in the Marches.¹⁴² And, in at least one case, a new man was made an feoffee to use on three separate occasions. Guy de Brian was first made as such in July of 1359 when he, along with John Seys and Thomas Andreu, were enfeoffed with the manors of Martley (Worcestershire), Sherston (Wiltshire) and Ashley (Hampshire) by Edward Despenser.¹⁴³ Later, in January 1366, he was, among such others as the duke of Lancaster, and the Earl of Hereford as an feoffee to use for a number of the earl of Arundel's lands in Surrey, Sussex and Wales, including the castle and town of Reigate (Surrey).¹⁴⁴ Finally, in March of 1373, Brian, along with the bishop of London and the earl of Arundel were pardoned for acquiring in fee from the earl of Hereford the manor of West Peckham (Kent) which they were then given licence to enfeoff to another group of feoffees.¹⁴⁵

But perhaps the most notable way in which a new man may be seen as finding recognition in the old nobility was through his inclusion in the wills of the latter. Sometimes, this could be in the form of being a witness or executor to a will. This was a particularly important office if the person making out the will wanted to make sure that his instructions, especially concerning the care of his soul, were carried out. Ralph Basset was noted as being either a witness to or an executor of the will of William Ferrers,

¹⁴² As well as three parts of the manor of Thaxted. CPR 1374-77, 33-34.

¹⁴³ CPR 1358-61, 244.

¹⁴⁴ CPR 1364-67, 198.

¹⁴⁵ CPR 1370-74, 264.

Lord of Groby in 1368 while in 1369, Basset, along with Roger Beauchamp and Guy Brian were all noted as being executors of the will of Thomas earl of Warwick.¹⁴⁶ Indeed, in the latter will these men received various tokens of the earl's affection, Beauchamp receiving "a ring, the best he can chose after the rest which(sic) are disposed of, also my next best tilting horse" while Brian received "a cup and a horse, the next best he can choose". Brian's presence again seems to have been particularly popular in such arrangements, also being included in the wills of Humphrey de Bohun, earl of Hereford, Richard earl of Arundel, as well as his fellow new man, Walter de Manny.¹⁴⁷ Whether because of an inherent trust in the king's judgement, or because contact with these men might have been seen as a good way to ingratiate oneself with the king, then, Edward's new creations seem to have been accepted by the establishment.

Thus, while Edward's patronage programme to his new men may be seen as creating a considerable amount of controversy when individual self interest was affected, and while his reign witnessed some of the more lively points in an on-going debate about the king's use of his feudal resources, few pointedly questioned the right of the king to "make" these men, or even more surprisingly, Edward's choice of new men. Indeed, to place the reputation of William Montagu or William Bohun with the likes of Piers Gaveston, the Despensers, or even Henry III's favourites, is to grossly misrepresent the situation by missing one of the primary characteristics of

¹⁴⁶ Testamenta Vetusta, ed. N.H. Nicolas (1826), i, 76, 80

¹⁴⁷ Testamenta Vetusta, i, 87, 89, 96.

Edward's patronage programme. For his choice of men was not simply based on his own personal preferences, as had often been the case with previous kings, but also on the constant reaffirmation, often in a very public venue, of their competence and ability, whether through statements in parliament as connected with the 1337 earldoms, victories on the battlefield, or celebrations connected with the Order of the Garter.¹ Indeed, the aura of chivalry and good service which surrounded Edward and most of his new men,² while not making the king himself exempt from criticism concerning the use of his resources, certainly seems to have prevented his new creations from being specifically targeted as foci of criticism, especially after the crisis of 1340-41. The acceptance of these men by the rest of the royal family and the old nobility in terms of legal, economic and social bonds apparently freely entered into, showed that they had few qualms in dealing with men who, though perhaps sometimes the king's 'favourites', had nonetheless proven themselves to the kingdom as a whole.

¹ According to Selden, it was in Edward III's reign that, in the charters recording an elevation, "those preambles expressing the convenience of advancing persons of merit to honour, or the merit of the persons created or both (which from thence to this day have for the most part continued in use) began to be prefixed to the Creations of Earls". Selden, Titles of Honour, 659. Prestwich, however, notes a precedent in the charter creating the earl of Carlisle in 1322 - though it must be said that Edward III does seem to have been the king to have made this a standard for ennoblement. Prestwich, Three Edwards, 148. Ormrod also notes the connection between good service and reward, especially as the reign progressed. See Ormrod, 'Edward III and the Recovery of Royal Authority', esp. 8. And, lower down the scale, "Even the status of knight was now coming to be conferred as a reward for promotion, particularly for valour". Powell and Walliss, House of Lords, 351.

² The importance of the chivalric ethos in the reign is discussed in depth by Vale, Edward III and Chivalry, esp. 42-91.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Conclusion

If creation also involved endowment one may well ask, why did the king wish to create new earls and other peers? If the members of the higher nobility were such obviously bad things, obstacles to good government, natural enemies to the royal authority, why didn't sensible kings let them die out? Why multiply a conspicuous evil, why create obstacles to one's own exercise of power? Was it just blind folly that led Edward III to reverse his grandfather's policy of limitation? To revive the lapsed earldom of Devon for Hugh Courtenay in 1335 and to create six new earldoms on a single day in March 1337? And five more by 1362? If not, then what were his reasons? And for summoning still more new men to his frequent parliaments?

Edward III's goal, according to McFarlane, was service which, along with royal kinship, were "the two motives for patronage throughout the centuries".¹ And, undoubtedly, as we have seen in the discussion of the circumstances surrounding Edward's accession to power, as well as the rhetoric in many of the grants themselves, this was his ultimate aim. But the question which must then be asked is how this manifested itself in Edward's endowment of his new men. What determined the king's day to day dispersal of grants to his new peerage creations, and was there any overall rationale to the patronage he granted out?

The first part of this question, I believe, has been sufficiently answered in the preceding chapters. The overall conclusion to be gained from these is that the interests of a new man - firstly geographical and secondly social - were an important determinant to the way in which grants were given out. After all, not to take into account such factors would

¹ McFarlane, Nobility, 156.

be to make any patronage so disbursed a waste of valuable resources.² Moreover, in many ways, such a policy had natural potential to augment the king's power. For example, as a new man's landed power increased in his sphere of influence, so too, if the man was loyal, did the king's more general control over the locality. For Thomas Bradeston's landed estate to be augmented in Gloucestershire also meant an increase in the king's overall control of the area. Similarly the grant of a wardship or marriage to a loyal new man was bound not only to increase the king's control over his tenants-in-chief as a whole, but also often over the estates and wards of the more problematic families of the 1320's such as the Mortimers and Despensers. That William Montagu and William Bohun - not to mention Thomas Dagworth, John Darcy, Guy Brian, and Walter Manny - had substantial control over both families' estates could not help but increase the king's power and standing. Finally, even the grant of offices could have the subsidiary benefit of having supporters in crucial positions in times of trouble. William Clinton's control of Dover and the Cinque Ports or William Bohun's guardianship of the Scottish Marches could easily make the difference between a successful and unsuccessful raid or invasion.

² Moreover, if A.L. Brown's statement concerning Henry IV's reign that "Almost all the letters under the great seal warranted 'By p.s.' and many of those warranted 'By K' originated with a written petition to the king", holds true for our period, much of Edward III's patronage, from whatever source, appears to have been originally influenced by a new man's petition. A.L. Brown, 'The Authorization of Letters under the Great Seal', *BIHR* xxxvii (1964), 148. For examples of this practice, see grants to Reginald Cobham. *CPR* 1334-38, 117, 401; *CPR* 1338-40, 105-06, 196; *CPR* 1337-47, 100; *CCharR* 1327-41, 467.

But this could not be the whole story. For Edward III simply to grant out patronage primarily to suit his new creations, with any royal advantage simply as a by-product dependent on their loyalty, was not only often impractical, it could also be a threat to the very royal power he was trying to augment. Indeed, for Edward to endow by this reasoning alone would be to risk a return to the domination by 'overmighty' subjects similar to that of his father's reign and the Minority, individuals bloated with lands and income via royal favour who not only threatened to excite civil war by their presence, but also to damage the power and prestige of the crown itself. Why then would a king, whose father had had so many problems with his titled and untitled nobility, want to build the power of this group back up on apparently unconditional grounds?

One must, therefore, question the more fundamental rationale behind Edward III's endowment programme. In other words, though Edward's ultimate goal was loyal and competent service, what was the purpose behind his distribution of patronage to these new men? Was it an attempt to permanently endow as many followers as he could with hereditary estates befitting their new ranks, thereby threatening to create dynasties which could easily move outside royal control? Or can his be seen as a somewhat less ambitious, and perhaps less dangerous, enterprise?

Though not entirely conclusive, evidence in favour of the latter view does exist in the particulars surrounding Edward III's patronage to his new men. Firstly, when land was readily available - either by escheat, forfeiture, or in

expectancy - by an extensive use of conditional grants, Edward III effectively made the estates he was creating for these individuals far less permanent than they otherwise need have been. Of ninety-three grants normally eligible to be given out in fee to his new creations,³ only forty-one were so granted containing, among other properties, five castles and thirty-eight manors.⁴ That this provisional nature was true of limited or life grants is obvious, but the use of entailed and tail male grants was also important in this respect. Though potentially, but not necessarily, of longer duration than life tenures, these types of grant would nevertheless rarely be permanent alienations, especially considering the infertility among the noble class as a whole in this period -⁵ a matter of which the king was well aware.⁶

³ This total of ninety-three grants has left out sixteen grants made from forfeited religious lands because, though these were eligible to be granted out permanently, they were not usually so granted - the king probably fearing that large scale permanent alienation of this sort would cause problems for him with Rome. Indeed, in Appendix 2, all the lands granted from forfeited religious lands are granted for limited terms - usually "during pleasure" or "for the duration of the war". On the use of forfeited church lands in this way, see p. 49, footnote 100.

⁴ It should be noted that all numbers are calculated from the last known status of a grant. Furthermore, it should be noted that twenty-one of these forty-one grants in fee contained lands in politically unstable areas - either in Wales or Scotland or their connected marches or elsewhere outside the kingdom of England such as France - and thus Edward may have been trying to reinforce tenuous claims by so granting the lands. See Appendix 2.

⁵ See pp. 9-10. It should also be noted concerning entails that, in the period 1200-1327, 22.7% of tenants-in-chief died childless - which, while perhaps not as high as death without male heir, still meant that any entailed lands had a little more than one in five chance of not returning to the king. See Waugh, *Lordship*, 18.

⁶ As indicated by Edward himself in his creation of the six earls in 1337. See above, p. 1. According to Prestwich, Edward I was also well aware of this tendency, and in the early fifteenth century there was even more proof of such knowledge in the form of the east window of the church of the

Indeed, when one looks at the terms of the land grants made during the reign, there was a prevalence of grants on conditional terms - fifty-two in total containing, among other properties, twelve castles and eighty-three manors, and accounting for six grants in entail, fifteen in tail male,⁷ fourteen for life, and seventeen for less than life (limited term) grants.⁸ Moreover, of the twenty-four men represented

Austin Friars in Norwich. Prestwich, The Three Edwards, 146; McFarlane, Nobility, 145-46. On the more general genealogical awareness of the mediaeval nobility, see Waugh, Lordship of England, 45. Waugh has also noted this trend for the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, referring to the fact that "less than a third of the original baronies descended through males" in the period 1200-1327. Waugh, Lordship of England, 19-20.

⁷ There appears, in fact, to be two types of tail male during this period. The first, which was used heavily in Edward's endowment programme, was limited to the male heirs of a grantee with reversion direct to the king. The second, used by the nobility and other lessor landowners, was a grant to the male heirs of a grantee with reversion to his "right heirs". The purpose behind the two varieties of grant was obvious. The first helped the king in ensuring that any land granted out was not permanently alienated, especially to collateral heirs. The second, often either connected with a sale or a deliberate adjustment in terms of one's tenure on a piece of land, was more all encompassing and was for the sake of the recipient in order to keep the lands in the male line, though allowing it to go to the "right heirs" if this failed. For some discussion of these two types in this period, see McFarlane, Nobility, 271-72. For some of the many examples of the first type, see the grant to Darcy of expectancies of some of the countess of Pembroke's manors and the 1337 earldom endowment of Robert Ufford. CCharR 1327-41, 428; CPR 1334-38, 418. For the only recorded examples of the second type within Edward's endowments, see the grant to Wilington of Maltravers' forfeited lands and the grant to John Montagu of the manor of Wark-upon-Tweed. CPR 1334-38, 561; CPR 1330-34, 462, 463, 520; CPR 1334-38, 162. Concerning the latter type, according to McFarlane, "By the 1360's so much concern for the interests of females was old-fashioned. The preference for the heir male was hardening into habit". McFarlane, Nobility, 272.

⁸ Though the sample is somewhat small, it is also notable that Edward's propensity for granting out tail male grants goes against the more general trends of the time, as Payling has recently argued that entail was far more prevalent than tail male in the later Middle Ages. See Payling, 'Social Mobility, Demographic Change, and Landed Society', 57. See also p. 32 footnote 14.

on Appendix 2, all but two held at least part of his estate on conditional terms while only eleven were ever granted lands in fee from the king. This, then, often made a family's retention of enough lands to stay within the peerage dependent either upon having direct heirs, and especially the ever illusive male heir, or on his descendants retaining enough royal favour to get such grants renewed.⁹ Most notably, the grants made in 1337 to those newly raised to earldoms were, almost to a manor, granted out in tail male, while overall only three of these men ever received lands in fee from the king.¹⁰ The chances were, then, that sooner or later a large portion of the lands Edward III had granted out in patronage to his new men would escheat to royal control - if not at the end of the term of tenancy or on the death of a new man, then not uncommonly within a generation or two.¹¹

Most of the more substantial of these grants, however, had been given out by the end of the 1330's. After this, many of the lands granted out tended to be forfeitures connected with alien religious lands, and therefore in practice often not granted out for long terms.¹² In some ways, then, Edward may have been said to have "shot his bolt" with respect to

⁹ Again, not a common occurrence. See below. Also, if Holmes is right and the movement of land among nobles was "hardly ever accidental" in this period, it would be surprising if the king himself did not take advantage of the hereditary controls available for similar purposes. See Holmes, Estates, 7. Moreover, it should also be remembered that entails could effectively stop a peer from selling the land involved. McFarlane, Nobility, 53, footnote one; 270.

¹⁰ See Appendix Two.

¹¹ For example, three of the six new earls created in 1337 - Clinton, Audley and Ufford - did not see their line pass a second generation.

¹² See above, p. 206 footnote 3.

patronage to his new men by this point,¹³ and afterwards had to use more temporary forms of reward to favour them.¹⁴ But this image of a land shortage later in the reign forcing a curtailment of permanent endowment should not be pushed too far. Indeed, that Edward never even tried to replace many of the annuities granted out with lands and rents may be seen as somewhat suspect. Though this may in part reflect the aforementioned scarcity of open land,¹⁵ the fact that many of these annuities went on for decades without the most cursory of attempts to fulfil them, even if only with expectancies,¹⁶ seems to indicate a lack of determination on Edward's part to find many of his men permanent endowments.¹⁷ Moreover, as the reign wore on, not only did straight annuities with no lands or rents attached become more common,¹⁸ but even the promises

¹³ See also Ormrod, Edward III, 58-59.

¹⁴ See Appendix 3, 5a. Especially considering that, as his children grew to maturity, he also had their endowment of which to think. For a discussion of Edward III's efforts for the sake of his family in this respect, see W.M. Ormrod, 'Edward III and his Family', 398-442.

¹⁵ Though there are numerous examples of land going to those outside Edward endowment programme and outside the royal family - his other main concern in the latter part of the reign. For examples from the Patent Rolls for the twelve month period following 1 February 1361, see CPR 1361-64, 20, 29, 45, 46, 57, 86, 94-95, 97, 109, 123, 138.

¹⁶ Moreover the fact that a number of the new creations - including the earls of Huntingdon, Gloucester and Derby - had no descendants eligible for parliamentary summons, and therefore for lands held in tail male, would have opened up the possibility of many of the lands so granted returning to the king. See Appendix 1. Indeed, that Edward was not adverse to granting expectancies on land he had already granted out in his patronage programme is seen in his grant to John Darcy in 1340 of the remainder of lands which Hugh de Audley had been granted in tail male in 1337. See above, p. 58 footnote 130.

¹⁷ See Appendix 5a.

¹⁸ Whereas prior to 1340, only one annuity, that to Henry of Grosmont in 1332 "because his father Henry earl of Lancaster has not yet made provision for him as becomes his estate, and also for his better maintenance in the king's service", was originally as a straight cash annuity - which was later

of lands connected with the annuity grants became less permanent. Whereas prior to 1340, all but three of fourteen annuities granted until lands and rents came in were in expectation of lands either in entail, tail male, or fee (though notably only four of the remaining eleven annuities were until lands in fee came in),¹⁹ after this point seven of nine such annuities granted were with only life land grants attached - including grants for Michael Poynings, Guy Brian and the earl of Stafford.²⁰ Edward III, then, possibly as a result of some of the more favoured of his new men's ambiguous stand in the 1340-41 crisis,²¹ was even less willing to grant out permanent estates as time went on, rather preferring to rely on annuities, wardships, and offices to show favour.²² Thus after this point, though

changed to a wardship anyway - after this point, seven "cash only" annuities were granted out, while one more was later changed to such. See Appendix 5a; for the Grosmont annuity, see also CPR 1330-34, 265.

¹⁹ Of the three that were not, two were for relatively untried new man of humble origins, Reginald de Cobham and Guy Brian, while the other was a grant simply until Henry of Grosmont came into his inheritance. See Appendix 5a.

²⁰ And of the two that were not, the grant to John Darcy was in expectation of the remainder of Pembroke lands promised in 1337, and that to Henry le Scrope was originally granted to his father, Geoffrey le Scrope (d. 1340), and was continued by royal favour for the sake of the son. See Appendix 5a. For Darcy, see CCharR 1327-41, 428; CCR 1343-46, 439; CPR 1343-1345, 208; for le Scrope, CPR 1361-64, 272. For the probable reason for this change in policy, see below.

²¹ Considering that not only had a substantial portion of the established nobility been against him during the crisis, but also some of those newly arisen whom he had especially favoured - like the earl of Huntingdon, and even at times the earls of Northampton and Salisbury - and such a policy was perhaps not all that surprising. Wilkinson, 'Protest of the Earls of Arundel and Surrey', 181. That Edward never forgot about Huntingdon's lack of support at this time is shown not only by his exclusion from the ranks of the Order of the Garter, but also by the fact that parts of his 1337 annuity seem to have gone unpaid for long periods of time. Ormrod, Edward III, 105; Appendix 5c.

"conspicuous and continuous service could be expected to be rewarded",²³ it was increasingly less common that it was rewarded permanently.²⁴

Finally, moving to a more general level, the number of new creations whose descendants were granted summons declined drastically after the first generation, even though the families in this particular group, defying McFarlane's numbers for the nobility as a whole, often continued in the male line. Of twenty-nine new creations who died during the reign and who had mature sons, eleven, including the sons of several of Edward's favourite bannerets such as Thomas de Bradeston, Thomas de Ughtred, Thomas Dagworth, and Michael Poynings, were nonetheless never summoned to parliament.²⁵ If

²² All of which were easily recalled. Lally believes wardships a popular form of patronage with Henry II, especially as it involved "no permanent alienation of royal rights" and that "grants of wardship could be revoked speedily and with ease". Lally, 'Secular Patronage in the Court of King Henry II', 163. See also Waugh, Lordship of England, 180. Moreover, Edward's emphasis on source based annuities, while mainly reflecting the most convenient route for the king to pay his new men annuities, also had the added advantage of being somewhat more controllable than exchequer assigned annuities as they required a royal writ, rather than a dormant warrant, each time they were paid. See p. 113 footnote 4; p. 119 footnote 31.

²³ Ormrod, Edward III, 105.

²⁴ At first glance, marriage as a patronage source was the exception to this statement. However, especially in the case of widows, not only was the king's say somewhat limited by the preferences of the new creation, and even the widow, but also the fact that the inheritances of these women had frequently been spoken for by the offspring of their first marriages meant that quite often any territorial gains did not remain with the new man beyond his lifetime - for example the gains made by Bohun as a result of his marriage to the widow of Edmund Mortimer and Dagworth's marriage to the earl of Ormond. This, along with the fact that some of the widows were past childbearing age by the time that they made their marriages - for example the countess of Lincoln and Eve de Clavering - meant that marriage commonly did not have a permanent impact on the estate of a new man. See Chapter Three, *passim*, and Appendix 3.

²⁵ See Appendix 1.

one adds to this the number of individuals who had no descendants eligible to be summoned during the reign, then thirty-five of the sixty-four families of new men were never again called individually to parliament, at least by Edward III.

Thus, from this evidence, added to the fact that the king not infrequently had less regard for the interests of the descendants of a new creation than he had had for the creation himself,²⁶ and Edward III's endowment programme to his new elevations may be seen to have had somewhat more limited aims than previously thought. To elaborate on McFarlane's answer to the questions posed at the beginning of this chapter, then, though the utility of the new creations was of great importance, one must also realize that, in many instances, Edward seems to have no clear intention of permanently endowing new noble lines. Indeed, though it was fairly obvious that the king needed such men for "service", this does not necessarily mean he would want to ennoble their descendants in perpetuity. An individual might possess qualities which would endear or make him of use to the king - that the rest of his line would have those same qualities, however, was by no means certain. Thus, perhaps Edward did not "reverse his grandfather's policy of limitation" with respect to the nobility,²⁷ but rather simply used different methods - especially the extensive use of conditional land grants, wardships and annuities - to achieve similar ends.

²⁶ For example, see the discussion of the fortunes of the second earl of Salisbury as well as the legal challenges faced by the heirs of John Darcy and John de Wilington in Chapter Seven. See pp. 177-82, 183-87.

²⁷ McFarlane, Nobility, 156.

The prevalent idea that Edward III had it in mind to create a hereditary 'new nobility' should, then, perhaps be rethought - or, at the very least, toned down. For, from the material available, the way Edward actually used the resources open to him seems to suggest a lack of firm resolve to ennoble permanently all but a handful of his new creations and their descendants - from the way he distributed rank and patronage, it is often difficult to argue anything more. Yet, in treatments of the period, it is generally accepted that Edward set about trying to 'create' a new hereditary nobility,²⁸ and that in the end there was often no permanence to the results of his efforts simply because of the chance of hereditary survival. Historians look to the rhetorical flourishes of the grants, and in particular those connected with the creation of the six earls in 1337, as proof of this. But, from the evidence available, especially in connection with the terms on which much of the patronage was granted out, this might be taking such statements too much at face value - and crediting Edward III with too little common sense, and too little foresight. At the beginning of this thesis, the development of the parliamentary peerage was discussed, and it is here that I would like to start to close it. For the development of this institution was obviously bound sooner or later to compete with the monarch for power as, the more stratified it got, and the more hereditary it became, the further out of the ambit of the king's personal

²⁸ See above, pp. 24-25. This idea has also made its way into histories of the fifteenth century as part of the "overmighty noble" aspect of the Wars of the Roses. For example, see Pollard, Wars of the Roses, 49-50.

control it moved. Indeed, it was the members of the peerage, rapidly developing from an amorphous concept of nobility, which had caused the problems during the 1320's, and had the potential to cause more. Such developments could but grow under a weak king like Edward II, especially with determined characters like Thomas of Lancaster in the thick of things - but it was also natural that a strong king like Edward III should attempt to control it.²⁹ And, though it could never be argued that Edward 'packed' the peerage by these means,³⁰ nonetheless by placing within it a number of individuals friendly to him and, more importantly, men he could often control as a result of the dependent and tenuous nature of their estates, Edward could limit the implications of these developments.³¹ Indeed, a view of Edward cautiously stringing many of his new men along with the promise of landed estates - and giving them annuities and custodianships in the meantime - is perhaps not all that far off the mark. In other words, the case may be made that Edward was trying to influence the power of a growing hereditary peerage not only by making a substantial number of its members dependent on royal goodwill, but also by not allowing for much of the

²⁹ That Edward would have been well aware of the growing importance of the peerage as a group was well evident in the crisis of 1340-41, and especially the calls by the peers to be able to try their own. See RP ii, 132-33; for an indepth treatment of the crisis, see Harriss, King Parliament and Public Finance, 253-312.

³⁰ Even in 1351, at the height of the reign, 'new men' individually summoned to parliament made up only about a quarter of all men summoned. See W.A. Dugdale, ed., A Perfect Copy of All Summons of the Nobility to the Great Councils and Parliaments of the Realm (1685), 243-45.

³¹ Ormrod has gone so far as to say that the annuities to Stafford and Warwick in the middle of the reign had essentially made them "permanent retainers of the crown". Ormrod, Edward III, 105.

patronage granted out to remain out indefinitely.³² Moreover, if all this was obvious to men of the time - which the common usage of the nonhereditary term 'banneret' for many of the lesser of these new men seems to indicate -³³ it may, in turn, help explain why the kingdom as a whole was generally more willing to accept these men en masse as they never had a single Despenser or Gaveston.

Indeed, as much as anything else, this thesis has been about the first coherent acknowledgement by a monarch of the importance of influencing the composition of the parliamentary peerage. Edward III's reaction to the growth of the institution, as manifested in his programme of elevation and patronage of a number of "new men", marked the growing realization by the king that it was imperative for him to retain some degree of control over and say in the composition of an institution which otherwise, by 'precedent, the record and the shadowy notion of barony', threatened to move further and further outwith royal power. Indeed, control over new recruitment, manifested primarily in Edward III's endowment and elevation of his own candidates, had become firmly a part

³² It is also significant that many of the bannerets which Edward was endowing before the 1340-41 crisis were only raised after it, usually as a reflection of their part in the council of 1342. Indeed, Edward III appears, by such tactics, to have decided to make 'banneret' a noble rank during the reign, perhaps as a reaction to the problems he had encountered with the peerage in 1340, and certainly as part of a more general attempt to influence the composition of the parliamentary peerage. See Crouch, Image of Aristocracy, 118; Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 349; Appendix 1.

³³ "For it was never conceived that the title Banneret, as it denotes a Knight Banneret, was hereditarie", and this limitation seems to have continued when "banneret" developed into a parliamentary rank. J. Selden, Titles of Honour (1631), 737; see also Saul, Knights and Esquires, 7-10; Prestwich, Three Edwards, 139; Brown, Governance of Late Medieval England, 181.

of royal power by the end of the reign.³⁴ As a result, despite all the social stratification taking place in the fourteenth century, by such means Edward III was still able to influence who was considered 'noble' within his kingdom. That some later kings failed to take heed of this practice was more a result of neglect or incompetence than lack of substantial precedent being set.³⁵

³⁴ Endowment and elevation had, according to Powell and Wallis, first been linked with the creation of Andrew de Harcla as earl of Carlisle in 1322. Raised as a result of his deeds at the battle of Boroughbridge, Harcla, though the son of a sheriff of Cumberland and himself at different times during his career Warden of Carlisle, Sheriff of Cumberland and Warden of the West Marches and Cumberland and Westmoreland, does not appear to have previously held an estate befitting the rank of earl. Thus, in direct connection with this creation, he was granted "1000 marks a year of lands and rents to maintain his status, viz. 500 marks in the counties of Cumberland and Westmoreland and 500 marks a year in the Marches of Wales". As Powell and Wallis note, one of the new features of this grant, along with the fact it was specifically in reference for good service and the earldom was granted in tail male, was that "a substantial provision was made for maintaining the dignity". However, this seems to have been a one-off, aside from Mortimer's self-elevation in 1328, and does not appear to have been set practice until after 1330. See Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 296. CPR 1321-24, 93; G.E.C. iii, 31.

³⁵ On the "Closed Peerage" of the later fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, see Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 436-37.

APPENDIX 1
Elevations (1330-1377)¹

1) To the titled nobility

Audley, Hugh > Earl of Gloucester (1337)/n.e.d.²
 Bohun, William de > Earl of Northampton (1337)
 Clinton, William de > Earl of Huntingdon (1337)/n.e.d.
 Grosmont, Henry of > Earl of Derby (1337)/n.e.d.
 Montagu, William de > Earl of Salisbury (1337)
 Ufford, Robert de > Earl of Suffolk (1337)
 Stafford, Ralph de > Earl of Stafford (1351)
 Grosmont, Henry of > Duke of Lancaster (1351)/n.e.d.
 Holand, Thomas de > Earl of Kent (1360)³

2) To the parliamentary peerage

Audley, John de/1332/obscure
 Creting, John de/1332/n.e.d.
 Darcy, John/1332-34
 Hausted, John de/1332-36/d.n.s.⁴
 Verdon, John de/1332-36/n.e.d.
 Uvedale, Piers de/1332-36/n.e.d.
 Ros (of Watton), John de/1332-37/n.e.d.
 Kerdeston, Roger de/1332-37
 Sutton, John de/1332-37
 Talbot, Gilbert/1332-43⁵

¹ Compiled from G.E. Cockayne (ed.) Complete Peerage, rev. et ed. V. Gibbs, 12 vols (1910-1959), checked against William Dugdale's A Perfect Copy of All Summons of the Nobility to the Great Councils and Parliaments of the Realm and cross-referenced with Powell and Wallis's House of Lords. In this appendix, all forms and spellings of surnames as per The Complete Peerage. In the text and the rest of the appendices, however, the form and spellings of surnames, where applicable, have conformed to modern usage.

² No descendants eligible to be called to parliament during the reign - or, in the case of the titled nobility, to hold the title.

³ At least, once summoned to parliament as such. G.E.C. vii, 152. Also referred to as such in the Fine Rolls. See CFR 1356-68, 134.

⁴ Eligible descendant not summoned during reign. G.E.C. is sometimes inconsistent on this point. While most of the time the parliamentary summons to the descendants of new creations are noted in the entries, on the odd occasion they are not, leading one to believe that, though the right was inherited, the individual concerned was not actually called to parliament - even though according to Summons, they were so called. Again, Summons has been used as the final authority in this matter. For an example of this happening, see the case of Henry Percy. Summons, 159; G.E.C. x, 459-62.

⁵ Powell and Wallis count this man as having been summoned to Parliament before the coup, when in actuality he was only summoned to councils. See Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 314; Summons, 156-59.

Frene, Hugh de/1336/n.e.d.
 Erdington, Henry de/1336/d.n.s.
 Wilington, John de/1336-39/d.n.s.⁶
 Meinill, Nicholas de/1336-41/n.e.d.⁷
 Swynnerton, Roger de/1337/d.n.s.
 Leyburn, John de/1337-48/n.e.d.
 Chaundos, Roger de/1337-55/d.n.s.
 Grey (of Rotherfield), John de/1338-57
 Kirketon, Thomas de/1342⁸
 Bulmer, Ralph de/1344-48/d.n.s.
 Ughtred, Thomas/1344-64/d.n.s.
 Dagworth, Thomas de/1347/d.n.s.
 Bradeston, Thomas de/1347-60/n.e.d.
 Cobham (of Sterborough), Reynold de/1347-60
 Mauny, Walter de/1347-71/n.e.d.
 Brewose, Thomas de/1348/d.n.s.
 Saint Philibert, John de/1348/n.e.d.
 Coleville, Robert de/1348-64/n.e.d.⁹
 Husee, Roger/1348-49/n.e.d.
 Bouchier, Robert/1348-49/d.n.s.
 Lovel, Richard/1348-50/n.e.d.
 Montagu, Edward de/1348-60/n.e.d.
 Poynings, Michael de/1348-68/d.n.s.
 Musgrave, Thomas de/1350-73
 Burnell, Nicholas/1350-83¹⁰
 Bryan, Guy de/1350-89/n.e.d.
 Scrope, Henry le/1350-91
 Beauchamp (of Warwick), John/1350-52/n.e.d.
 Huntingfield, William de/1351-60, 1371-76/n.e.d.
 Holand, Thomas de/1354-57
 Montagu, John de/1357-89
 Lisle, Gerard de/1358
 Benhale, Robert of/1360/n.e.d.
 Ufford, John de/1360/n.e.d.
 Norwich, John de/1360/d.n.s.
 Kirketon, John de/1362-63/n.e.d.
 Stryvelyn, John de/1363/n.e.d.
 Bohun, John de/1363-66
 Beauchamp, Roger (of Blestoe)/1363-79
 De la Pole, Michael/1366-84
 Poynings, Luke de/1368-76/d.n.s.

⁶ Although Wilington continued to be called for almost a year after his death in December 1338, in which time there were three further summons, G.E.C. suggests might have been for his son. See G.E.C. xii:2, 647-48.

⁷ Though his father and grandfather were summoned, he was illegitimate, and therefore it was through the king's favour that he was summoned. See G.E.C. viii, 632; Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 323 footnote 40.

⁸ Powell and Wallis disagree with The Complete Peerage here, the former saying that he was summoned to parliament, the latter he was not, though Summons only list him as being called to the council of 1342. See Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 349, footnote 16; G.E.C. vii, 338, Summons, 219.

⁹ Barony by sitting from 1331 onwards. See G.E.C. iii, 375.

¹⁰ Formerly Haudlo. See Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 357-58.

Botreaux, William de/1368-90
 Aton, William/1371/n.e.d.
 Heron, William/1371
 Basset, Ralph (of Sapcote)/1371-72/n.e.d.
 Aldeburgh, William/1371-86
 Scrope, Richard le/1371-1402
 Stafford, Richard de/1371-79¹¹
 Cromwell, Ralph de/1375-97
 Clifton, John de/1376-88

¹¹ No entry in The Complete Peerage. Of a cadet line of the earl of Stafford - perhaps the brother of Ralph, earl of Stafford. CFR 1347-56, 394. See Powell and Wallis, House of Lords, 369. There was a Richard Stafford who was active in the royal administration of Wales in the 1340's, though it is unclear if this was the same person. J.G. Edwards ed., Calendar of Ancient Correspondence Concerning Wales (1935), 226-27, 229-30, 233.

APPENDIX 2

Escheats, Expectancies, and Forfeitures¹

Source

k= lands already in the king's possession
 s= lands in the king's possession by voluntary surrender
 e= grants in expectancy (eg. reversions, remainders)
 for = lands in the king's possession by forfeiture or
 involuntary surrender²
 o= other

Term of Tenure

m= minority
 lt= limited term, during the king's pleasure, or
 for the duration of war
 l= life grant
 t= tail male
 en= entailed
 f= in fee

Title Abbreviations

A.= Abbot
 A.P.= Alien Priory
 C.= Countess
 E.= Earl
 I.= Island
 L.= Lord
 Q.= Queen
 P.= Priory

Date	Name	Source	Term	County	Last Holder
c.1331	Frene	for	lt	Hereford	R. Mortimer ³
18/01/31	Montagu, W	s	en	Dorset	W. Montagu ⁴
		k	en	Bucks	E. Pynkeney ⁵
		for	en	Hants	Q. Isabella ⁶
		for	en	Berks	Q. Isabella ⁷
		for	en	Kent	Q. Isabella ⁸
18/01/31	Montagu, W	for	f	Wales	R. Mortimer ⁹

¹ All spellings of place names in the text and appendices of this thesis are taken from those in the indices of the HMSO published material (eg. Patent Rolls, Close Rolls, Fine Rolls, etc).

² Unless otherwise noted, the assumption being made is that all grants of Scottish lands were the result of forfeitures.

³ The manors of Marden, Bredwardine, and Winforton.

⁴ The castle of Sherborne. Previously granted for life on 27 May 1330. CPR 1327-30, 528.

⁵ The manor of Fulmer.

⁶ The manors of Christchurch Twynham, Westover and Ringwood.

VCH: Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, iv, 608; v, 92.

⁷ The manor of Crokham. VCH: Berkshire, iii, 314.

⁸ The manor of Catford in Leuesham.

⁹ The castle, town, manor and honour of Denbigh, and the cantreds of Rhos, Rhyfniog and Carmarthen and the commote of Dinmael.

22/01/31	Ros	for	lt	Rutland	S. Bereford ¹⁰
24/01/31	Ufford, R	k	t	Essex	J. Botetort ¹¹
		e	t	Norfolk	J. Claveryng ¹²
		for	t	Kent	Q. Isabella ¹³
		for	t	Norfolk	Q. Isabella ¹⁴
08/02/31	Ufford, R	for	lt	Norfolk	Q. Isabella ¹⁵
12/02/31	Ufford, R	for	lt>t>f	London	J. Maltravers ¹⁶
20/08/31	Darcy	for	lt>l	Wilts	Dispenser, sr. ¹⁷
16/10/31	Bohun, W	k	lt	York	E. of Kent ¹⁸
28/01/32	Beauchamp, J	o	lt	Worcs	R. Mortimer ¹⁹
25/03/32	Darcy	for	l	Wilts	Dispenser, sr. ²⁰
09/09/32	Bohun, W	s	en	Berks	E. of Norfolk ²¹
		s	en	Oxon	E. of Norfolk ²²
		s	en	Bucks	E. of Norfolk ²³
		s	en	Lincs	E. of Norfolk ²⁴
		s	en	Notts	E. of Norfolk ²⁵
		s	en	Gloucs	E. of Norfolk ²⁶
		s	en	Essex	E. of Norfolk ²⁷
		s	en	Sussex	E. of Norfolk ²⁸
17/09/32	Swynnerton	k	l	Cheshire	R. de Felton ²⁹
17/09/32	Swynnerton	k	l	Staffs	R. de Sapy ³⁰
25/01/33	Montagu, W	k	en	Somerset	M. Montagu ³¹

¹⁰ Lands in Ketton and Kiltorp.

¹¹ Two thirds of the manor of Gestingthorpe.

¹² The manor of Costessey.

¹³ The manor of Gravesend.

¹⁴ The manor of Burgh.

¹⁵ The manors of Causton and Fakenhamdam until the reversion of the manor of Costessey came in. Causton was later granted to him for ten years at a rent of £60 a year. CPR 1334-38, 389.

¹⁶ The house called 'le Bas court' by Cripplegate.

¹⁷ The manor of Marston Meysy. Later granted to remain for life to his son as a result of a grant on 20 February 1338. CPR 1338-40, 16.

¹⁸ The farm of the manor of Collingham, until the majority of the heir. CPR 1330-34, 193.

¹⁹ Grant for eight years of the manor of Norton and Bromsgrove. CCR 1327-37, 296; See also VCH Worcestershire, iii, 22.

²⁰ The manor of Wyke-Valors by Marston Meysy.

²¹ The manors of Hinton and Spene.

²² The manors of Haseley, Ascot, Deddington, Pyrton and Kirklington.

²³ The town and manor of Wycombe.

²⁴ The manor of Long Bennington.

²⁵ The manor of Kneesul.

²⁶ The manor of Newnham.

²⁷ The manor of Wix. On September 13, he was granted the £800 rent from this estate for life as well. CPR 1330-34, 335.

²⁸ A farm of £42 from the manor of Bosham.

²⁹ The manor of Shotwick.

³⁰ The hundred of Pirhull.

³¹ The manor of Hurcott.

08/06/33	Montagu, W	for	lt>f	I. of Man	32
26/07/33	Bradeston	e	f	Somerset	W. de Pavely ³³
		e	f	Somerset	W. Dovyll ³⁴
02/08/33	Montagu, W	o	l>t	Berwick	W. Montagu ³⁵
01/10/33	Ughtred	for	f	Scotland	J. Stiward ³⁶
21/10/33	Talbot	for	l	York	Q. Isabella ³⁷
18/12/33	Swynnerton	for	lt>f	Chester	Despenser, jr. ³⁸
02/03/34	Montagu, W	for	f	Berwick	J. Publes ³⁹
16/07/34	Swynnerton	for	f	Chester	Despenser, sr. ⁴⁰
		for	f	Staffs	Despenser, sr. ⁴¹
24/07/34	Montagu, W	for	lt	Scotland	⁴²
01/04/35	Manny	e	f	Bucks	I. Carbonel ⁴³
		for	f	Bucks	E. of Athol ⁴⁴
04/04/35	Manny	for	f	Norfolk	E. of Athol ⁴⁵
06/04/35	Darcy	for	t	Ireland	R. Mortimer ⁴⁶
		e	t	Ireland	H. Sutton ⁴⁷
20/04/35	Montagu, W	e	f	Berks	E. Lestraunge ⁴⁸

³² It seems to have been held prior to this by the Scots. See W.A. Moore, A History of the Isle of Man (1900; reprint 1977), 194-95.

³³ The manor of Stratton-on-the-Foss.

³⁴ A parcel of lands in Knolle by Bristol - later referred to as a manor. CPR 1334-38, 561-62. Originally a forfeiture of Thomas de Gournay, this was later won back by his widow, and Bradeston was granted, as compensation, that the manor of Kingsland, which he held in wardship, would in future be free of any rent - as well as provision for an exchequer annuity if the wardship be taken out of his hands until lands and rents in fee could be found. CPR 1334-38, 561-62. See Appendix 3.

³⁵ The manor of Wark-upon-Tweed. This was previously granted for life to Montagu in January 1329. CFR 1327-37, 116, 129; CPR 1327-30, 386, 392. On 3 March 1332, it was granted to Montagu with remainder to his son, John, in tail male. CPR 1330-34, 462, 463, 520; CPR 1334-38, 162. This was one of the few cases in Edward's land grants to his new men where, upon the failure of a tail male grant, the lands were to go to the "right heirs" - in this case those of John. See p. 207 footnote 7.

³⁶ The manor of 'Benchill' and all other lands and tenements of John Stiward, a Scottish knight. Rotuli Scotiae i, 273-44.

³⁷ The manor of Wetelawe [Wheatley?] by Doncaster. See CPR 1330-33, 479.

³⁸ The manor of Little Barrow.

³⁹ A messuage and £4. 10s. 6d. rent in Berwick-upon-Tweed.

⁴⁰ The manor of Barrow.

⁴¹ Lands and rents in Rushton, Corneford, Alstonfield and Caldon.

⁴² The manor of Edeneham, Roxburghshire.

⁴³ The manor of Chersley (part of the earl of Atholl's forfeited lands).

⁴⁴ The manor of Beachington.

⁴⁵ The manors of Stiffkey and Holkham.

⁴⁶ The manors of Rathwer and Kildalk. The former was later granted to Nicholas Verdon for six years, after which time it was come back to Darcy. CCR 1333-37, 591-92.

⁴⁷ The grange of Rathwer.

⁴⁸ The manor of Bisham.

20/04/35	Montagu, W	k	f	Bucks	E. Pynkeney ⁴⁹
12/07/35	Montagu, W	e	f	Dorset	R. FitzPaine ⁵⁰
		e	f	Wilts	R. FitzPaine ⁵¹
18/08/35	Bradeston	for	f	Scotland	E. of March ⁵²
08/10/35	Stryvelyn	e	f	Northumb	J. Crumbwell
					+ T. Bamburgh ⁵³
					⁵⁴
10/10/35	Montagu, W	for	f	Scotland	
30/10/35	Manny	k	f	Northants	R. de Grey ⁵⁵
21/03/36	Ufford, R	k	f	Suffolk	R. Ufford ⁵⁶
05/04/36	Bohun, W	e	m	Staffs	I. de Audley ⁵⁷
		e	m	Gloucs	J. de Bohun ⁵⁸
14/03/37	Brian	e	f	Sussex	A. de Sapy ⁵⁹
16/03/37	Cobham	k	l>f	Wilts	E. of Cornwall ⁶⁰
16/03/37	Montagu, W	e	t	Wilts	E. of Surrey ⁶¹
		e	t	Dorset	E. of Surrey ⁶²
		e	t	Somerset	E. of Surrey ⁶³
17/03/37	Audley, H	o	l	Rutland	M. Audley ⁶⁴
18/03/37	Bohun, W	e	t	Lincoln	E. of Surrey ⁶⁵
		e	t	Northant	C. of Pembroke ⁶⁶
		e	t	Rutland	E. of Gloucs ⁶⁷
18/03/37	Ufford, R	k	t	Suffolk	E. of Cornwall ⁶⁸

⁴⁹ The manor of Datchet.

⁵⁰ The manors of Wootton FitzPaine, Frome Whitfeld, Marshwood, and Worth Matravers.

⁵¹ The manor of Pool Keynes.

⁵² That is, Patrick Dunbar. The manors of Dunse and Cherneside in the county of Berwick upon Tweed.

⁵³ The manors of Belsay and Newlands and connected properties. This was extended in 1360. CPR 1358-61, 427.

⁵⁴ The Forest of Selkirk and Etryk, the town and county of Selkirk, the town and county of Pebles.

⁵⁵ The manor of Overstone. Previously forfeited by John Maltravers. CFR 1327-37, 287.

⁵⁶ The castle and town of Ufford. Previously granted for life. CPR 1327-1330, 521; CPR 1330-34, 184.

⁵⁷ The manor of Arley.

⁵⁸ The manor of Bisley.

⁵⁹ A messuage and 300 acres of land and pasture in the marsh of Pevensey called 'Godeleysond'.

⁶⁰ The manor of Chippenham.

⁶¹ The castle and manor of Trowbridge, and the manors of Aldbourne, Amesbury and Winterburn.

⁶² The manor of Canford.

⁶³ The manors of Henstridge and Charleton.

⁶⁴ The castle, manor and town of Oakham. Audley was granted an extension to his own life of the life grant to his wife Margaret of the property. CPR 1334-38, 414-15.

⁶⁵ The castle, manor and town of Stamford and the manor and town of Grantham.

⁶⁶ The manor of Fotheringhay.

⁶⁷ The castle and manor of Oakham and the county of Rutland.

⁶⁸ The castle, town, manor and honour of Eye, the manor of Thorndon, the manor of Hanley, and the hundreds of Hartismere and Stowe. On 18 August 1338 £20 paid yearly by the prior of Bromholm for a fifth part of the manor of Baketon, previously part of the honour, was included in this grant. CPR 1334-38, 496.

		k	t	Norfolk	E. of Cornwall ⁶⁹
		e	t	Suffolk	E. Ferre ⁷⁰
19/03/37	Clinton	k	t	Lincoln	E. of Cornwall ⁷¹
		e	t	Hunts	Q. Isabella ⁷²
		e	t	Hunts	C. of Pembroke ⁷³
25/07/37	Ufford, R	for	t	Essex	J. Stuteville ⁷⁴
b.08/37	Stryvelyn	for	f	Scotland	⁷⁵
16/08/37	Montagu, W	e	f	Oxford	J. de Haudlo ⁷⁶
01/09/37	Darcy	e	t	York	C. of Pembroke ⁷⁷
		e	t	Lincs	C. of Pembroke ⁷⁸
18/09/37	Montagu, W	for	lt>f	Somerset	J. Fienles ⁷⁹
25/09/37	Audley, H	for	t	Notts	J. Stuteville ⁸⁰
		for	t	Derby	J. Stuteville ⁸¹
01/10/37	Montagu, W	e	f	Cheshire	Q. Isabella ⁸²
		e	f	Norfolk	Q. Isabella ⁸³
		e	f	Suffolk	Q. Isabella ⁸⁴
		e	f	Lincoln	Q. Isabella ⁸⁵
03/10/37	Grosmont	for	lt ⁸⁶	Norfolk	C. of Eu ⁸⁷
		for	lt	York	C. of Eu ⁸⁸
19/12/37	Wilmington	for	en	Wales	J. Maltravers ⁸⁹
		e	en	Wiltshire	M. Giffard ⁹⁰
15/02/38	Ufford, R	k	t	Suffolk	⁹¹

⁶⁹ The manor of Cawston.

⁷⁰ The manor of Benhall

⁷¹ The manor of Kirton.

⁷² The manors of Holme and Glatton.

⁷³ The site of the castle of Huntingdon.

⁷⁴ The manor of Dedham.

⁷⁵ The Baronies of Bathket and Rathew, the lands and mills of Dene, and the suit of the town of Edinburgh "to the mills". These were later seized back by the Scots. CPR 1334-38, 482.

⁷⁶ The manor of Beckley.

⁷⁷ The manors of Newsam Temple and Hurst Temple.

⁷⁸ The manor of Torksey.

⁷⁹ The manor of Martock.

⁸⁰ The manor of Kirkby in Ashfield.

⁸¹ The manor of Eckington.

⁸² The castle and manor of Hawarden, the stewardship of Chester, and the manors of Lee, Bosley and Neston.

⁸³ The manor of Kenninghall.

⁸⁴ The manors of Framsdan and Cassingland and a carucate of land and £20 rent in the towns of Framsdan and Cassingland.

⁸⁵ The manor of Mablethorpe, lands in Harmston and the castle and town of Mold.

⁸⁶ For the life of his father.

⁸⁷ The manor of Wighton and the hundred of Northgreneho.

⁸⁸ The manor of Laughton-en-le-Morthen.

⁸⁹ Grant to John de Wilmington, Ralph his son and Eleanor, his daughter-in-law, of the castle of Carreg Cennan and the Commote of Is Cennan, with reversion to the "right heirs" of Ralph. CPR 1334-1338, 561; see also p. 207 footnote 7.

⁹⁰ Grant to John de Wilmington, Ralph his son and Eleanor, his daughter-in-law, of the manors of Broughton Giffard, Eliston and Orcheston with reversion to the "right heirs" of Ralph. CPR 1334-1338, 561; see also p. 207 footnote 7.

⁹¹ £11. 3s. 4d. of rent from a fee farm and 15s of rent from a yearly scutage paid at the exchequer by John son of Robert de

01/03/38	Beauchamp, R	e	l>f	Oxford	J. Weston ⁹²
04/01/38	Montagu, W	for	f	Oxford	P. de Oo ⁹³
29/04/38	Manny	k	f	N. Wales	⁹⁴
03/07/38	Ughtred	k/e	f	York	N. de Hugate ⁹⁵
07/07/38	Cobham	k	l	Norfolk	⁹⁶
04/09/38	Cobham	for	lt	Sussex	Bec Hellouin ⁹⁷
12/01/39	Cobham	k	l	Oxford	T. Poynings ⁹⁸
12/10/39	Bradeston	k	f	Surrey	T. Poynings ⁹⁹
05/11/39	Manny	k	l	Northants	R. de Foxton ¹⁰⁰
01/03/40	Darcy	e	l	Derby	H. Audley ¹⁰¹
		e	l	Notts	H. Audley ¹⁰²
		for	l	Ireland	Count of Eu ¹⁰³
04/04/40	Bradeston	e	f	S. Wales	C. of Lincoln ¹⁰⁴
24/04/40	Bradeston	for	lt	Gloucs	W. de Melton ¹⁰⁵
13/05/40	Cobham	e	f	Kent	C. of Pembroke ¹⁰⁶
15/12/40	Bohun, W	e	t	Essex	Q. Philippa ¹⁰⁷
09/02/41	Brian	e	f	Devon	J. de Carreu ¹⁰⁸
16/06/41	Grosmont	for	lt	A.P.	P. of Lapley ¹⁰⁹
17/02/42	Grosmont	k	lt	S. Wales	
18/02/42	Darcy	for	lt	A.P.	A. of Lire ¹¹⁰
18/02/42	Clinton	for	lt	A.P.	P. of Throwley
08/05/42	Grosmont	for	lt	A.P.	P. of Newent
15/05/42	Bradeston	for	lt	A.P.	A. of Fecamp ¹¹¹

Thorpe of a moiety of the manor of Combs, a quit-claim of £11. 18s. 4d. of rent due by the earl for the other moiety.

⁹² The manor of Bloxham.

⁹³ A messuage in Oxford.

⁹⁴ The manor of Aber.

⁹⁵ Two parts of a messuage in Petergate, York, and a grant in expectancy of the dower portion of the messuage on the death of Isabella de Burdon.

⁹⁶ The farm of £55 of the town of Great Yarmouth.

⁹⁷ The manors of West Preston and Hoo of the temporalities of the alien abbot of Bec Hellouin.

⁹⁸ The king's mills beneath the castle of Oxford and the meadow called 'Kyngesmede.'

⁹⁹ The manor of Shalford.

¹⁰⁰ £50 of the farm of the town of Northampton

¹⁰¹ The manor of Eckington. Both this grant and the next one were originally granted in fee, but on the same day were changed to life grants. CPR 1338-40, 441-42, 458-59.

¹⁰² The manor of Kirkby in Ashfield.

¹⁰³ The manors of Louth and Balyogary.

¹⁰⁴ The castle and manor of Llanfair and the land and lordship of Buith.

¹⁰⁵ The guardianship of the temporalities of York in the county of Gloucester.

¹⁰⁶ The manor of Strood.

¹⁰⁷ The manors of Eastwood and Rayleigh with the honour of Rayleigh and the hundred of Rochford.

¹⁰⁸ Her lands in Dartmouth, Clifton, and Hardenesse.

¹⁰⁹ The castle, town and county of Carmarthen and the lordship of Cantref Mawr.

¹¹⁰ The estate of the abbot of Lyre in England. This was held with Master William de Fyncheden

¹¹¹ A parcel of lands and rents in Horsham (Sussex).

15/04/43	Cobham	for	lt	Estate	J. Marschal ¹¹²
06/12/43	Stryvelyn	k	lt>f	Northumb	R. de Rodum ¹¹³
20/12/43	Stryvelyn	e	t>l	Yorkshire	R. de Nevil ¹¹⁴
20/03/44	Brian	for	lt	Somerset	J. Molyns ¹¹⁵
11/02/46	Brewes	for	lt	Berks	A. of Beaulieu ¹¹⁶
18/06/46	Beauchamp, J	e	f>l	Worcs	T. Haukeston ¹¹⁷
05/10/46	Stryvelyn	k	f	Scotland	P. de Hely ¹¹⁸
07/02/47	Cobham	e	en	Kent	G. Corder ¹¹⁹
01/06/47	Grosmont	for	t	France	L. of Bergerac ¹²⁰
08/06/47	Poynings	for	lt>l	Estate	M. de la Beche ¹²¹
05/09/47	Cobham	for	f	Estate	T. de Arden ¹²²
20/09/47	Bradeston	for	f	France	F. Bougounere ¹²³
03/10/47	Grosmont	for	t	France	¹²⁴
08/10/47	Grosmont	for	f	France	B. Barraut ¹²⁵
18/10/47	Brian	k	l	London	R. Conductu ¹²⁶
10/11/47	Grosmont	k	t	Derby	¹²⁷
18/11/48	Heron	e	f	Northumb	A. de Hornclyff+ R. Cornhale ¹²⁸
		for	f	Northumb	R. de Aulton + I. Cornhale ¹²⁹
		for	f	Northumb	W. Pendregest ¹³⁰
		for	f	Northumb	T. de Gosewyk ¹³¹

¹¹² The estate of John le Marschal of Changeton.

¹¹³ Lands in Roddam. "In the king's hand on account of the rebellion of Adam, son of Henry de Rodom". CFR 1337-47, 348.

¹¹⁴ And S. Treganon. The manor of Faxfleet and 10 marks of rent in North Dalton.

¹¹⁵ The manor of Stoke Trister.

¹¹⁶ The manor of Inglesham and the messuage and lands in Faringdon.

¹¹⁷ The manor of Oddingley. Later apparently changed to a life grant. See CFR 1356-68, 156-57.

¹¹⁸ Lands in Paxton. Hely was a servant of Stryvelyn. Rotuli Scotiae i, 675

¹¹⁹ The manor of West Cliffe.

¹²⁰ The castle and town of Bergerac on the Dordogne.

¹²¹ Lands of Margery late the wife of Nicholas de la Beche in the counties of Oxford, Berkshire, Wiltshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Surrey and Sussex.

¹²² The estate of Thomas de Ardern.

¹²³ An inn in the high street of Calais.

¹²⁴ "The lands, vineyards and other goods of such of the prisoners of war taken by him at the time of the capture of the town of St. Jean d'Angley". CFR 1345-48, 562, 566.

¹²⁵ Houses and connected possessions of Bernard Barraut, burgess of St. Jean d'Angley.

¹²⁶ Tenements and rents in London.

¹²⁷ The castle of Horston and £40 yearly from the farm of Derby.

¹²⁸ The manor of Thornton.

¹²⁹ Eight messuages and 168 acres of land in Cornhale.

¹³⁰ A parcel of lands and rents by the Tweed.

¹³¹ Three messuages and eighty acres of land in Goswick.

20/11/47	Stryvelyn	k	f	Berwick	P. de Heye ¹³²
		for	f	Berwick	A. de Murref ¹³³
27/01/48	Ufford, R	for	en	London	F. de Creye ¹³⁴
07/08/48	Stafford, R	for	lt	Ireland	E. of Desmond ¹³⁵
13/02/49	Beauchamp, R	for	lt	Gloucs	A. of Beaubec ¹³⁶
20/06/49	Grosmont	for	f	Warwick	J. Murdak ¹³⁷
30/06/50	Brian/Manny	for	lt	Estate	J. de Segrave ¹³⁸
10/02/50	Clinton	for	lt	A.P.	P. of Beaulieu
04/07/50	Beauchamp, R	for	lt ¹³⁹	England	John, bishop
	+ Brian				of Exeter ¹⁴⁰
14/10/51	Beauchamp, R	for	lt	London	A. Walpole ¹⁴¹
26/02/52	Brian	for	lt	A.P.	P. of
					Ottertton ¹⁴²
10/07/53	Brian	for	lt	Somerset	R. de Guyen ¹⁴³
26/07/53	Beauchamp, J	for	lt	A.P.	P. of Astley
20/05/54	Stafford, Ra	k	lt	Stafford	¹⁴⁴
	+ Ric				
17/06/54	Beauchamp, J	for	lt	Hertford	L. de Eyet ¹⁴⁵
10/11/54	Grosmont	k	f	Yorks(?)	R. Bygot ¹⁴⁶
25/08/58	Brian	for	lt	A.P.	P. of
					Beckford ¹⁴⁷
04/07/59	Brian	for	lt	A.P.	P. of
					Frampton ¹⁴⁸
25/10/59	Beauchamp, J	for	lt	A.P.	P. of Lewisham
					+ Greenwich

¹³² Lands in Paxton.

¹³³ The manor of Hutton and connected properties.

¹³⁴ A plot of land in the Cripplegate ward in London.

¹³⁵ The keeping of the castles, manors and lands in Ireland of Maurice, earl of Desmond, for which Stafford and Richard Talbot were to pay 800 marks a year at the exchequer. This was returned to Desmond in November 1349. CFR 1347-56, 93; G.E.C. iv, 239.

¹³⁶ The manors of Aston on Carrant and Ashton held by the alien abbot of Beaubec.

¹³⁷ A parcel of lands and rents in Shrewley.

¹³⁸ The issues of all the lands of John and Margaret Segrave.

¹³⁹ And Otto de Grandisson and Master Adam de Lichefeld, clerk.

¹⁴⁰ The guardianship of the temporalities of the bishopric of Exeter.

¹⁴¹ A messuage and twelve shops in the parish of St. John Zachary.

¹⁴² The keeping of the priory of Ottertton along with William de Alba Marlia and John Gogh. Changed on 28 April 1352 to Brian and brother Thomas Sedille. CFR 1347-56, 326

¹⁴³ The manor of Kingdown.

¹⁴⁴ The manors of Wrottesley and Buttertton, "in the king's hands for certain causes". CFR 1347-56, 394.

¹⁴⁵ The manor of Ayot Saint Lawrence.

¹⁴⁶ The yearly farm of 4 marks 10s due from Grosmont for the bailwick of Scalby within the forest of Pickering.

¹⁴⁷ To Brian and brother Alberic Vassel, canon of the monastery of Ste. Barbe in Normandy.

¹⁴⁸ To Brian and brother Laurence de Breoto, prior of Frampton.

APPENDIX 3 Marriages

p= previous grants
g= within peer's geographical sphere of influence
f= family or friends
n= no obvious connection

i) Grants of Marriage Rights

Date	Name	Family Name	Connection
20/01/31	G. Talbot	Pleys	n
15/12/31	T. Bradeston	Giffard	p/g
10/07/34	R. Ufford	St. Philbert	g
21/02/34	W. Montagu	Romeseye	g
30/05/36	J. Grey	Moreby	f
03/06/36	W. Montagu	Mortimer	p/g
03/09/37	W. Manny	Benstead	n
19/03/37	W. Montagu	Erleggh	g
02/07/40	W. Montagu	Mt. Hermerii	g
17/09/40	T. Bradeston	More	g
25/10/40	T. Bradeston	More	g
20/09/40	J. Darcy	Darcy	f/g
15/10/40	J. Darcy	Darcy	p/f/g
18/05/41	R. Burghcher	Amory	g
16/04/42	G. de Brian	Botiller	g
24/03/46	J. Darcy	Ormond	g
20/12/46	G. Brian	Pavely	n
10/07/46	R. Ufford	Bernak	g
04/12/47	G. Brian	Abbenhale	g
26/05/47	R. Beauchamp	St. Quintino	g
25/04/48	H. Grosmont	Verdon	f
1349	R. Basset	Botreaux	g
26/04/49	G. Brian	Welle	g
22/11/49	T. Ughtred	Conestable	g
14/10/50	M. Poynings	Bonet	g
03/01/51	W. Clinton	Sevance	g
28/07/51	W. Clinton	Twitham	g
01/05/52	Ra. Stafford	Plecy	g
22/10/53	G. Brian	Dynham	g
20/06/57	R. Cobham	Criketot	g
24/11/62	W. Heron ¹	Heton	g
14/11/63	T. Ughtred	Faucomberge	g
07/08/72	R. le Scrope	Tybetot	g
12/06/74	R. le Scrope	Bradeston	n

ii) Marriages of New Creations

Date	Name	Wife	Status
1289	R. Wilington	J. Neville	single
1294	J. Sutton	C. Sampson	single
c. 1302	J. Hausted	Roese	

¹ Along with Joan late the wife of Thomas de Heton, Edward Letham, 'chivalier', and Thomas de Clifford.

1307	R. Kerdeston	M. Bateman	single
1307	R. Lovel	M. de Soules	single
1312	J. Grey	C. Fitzalan	single
1313	Juliers	Jeane	single
1313	J. Maltravers	M. Berkeley	single
c.1314	J. Ros	M. Despenser	widow
b.1315	R. Chaundos	K. Talbot	single
b.1315	R. Chaundos	M. Pointz	widow
b.1315	F. Erdington	J. Wolvey	single
1317	H. Audley	M. de Gaveston	widow
1319	R. Bulmer	A. de Fauconberge	widow
1324	P. Uvedale	M. de Knoville	widow
c.1326	Ra. Stafford	K. Hastang	single
c.1327	W. Aton	I. de Percy	single
1327	W. Montagu	K. de Grandison	single
c.1327	W. Blount	M. Verdon	single
b.1328	T. Ughtred	M. Burdon	single
c.1329	R. Ufford	M. de Cailly	widow
c.1329	J. Leyburn	B. Corbet	widow
1329	J. Darcy	J. Fitzjohn	widow
b.05/29	R. Colville	Cicely	
c.1330	G. de Lisle	Eleanor	
1331	J. Kirkton	I. de Meriet	widow
c.1335	W. Bohun	E. de Mortimer	widow
c.1336	H. Frene	C. of Lincoln	widow
1336	Ra. Stafford	M. de Audley	single
b.1337	R. Beauchamp	S. Patshull	single
c.1337	T. Brewes	Beatrice ²	widow
c.1338	E. Montagu	Alice ³	single
c.1339	T. Holland	Joan, Countess of Kent	single ⁴
c.1339	N. Haudlo ⁵	M. Burnell	
b.1339	J. Stryvelyn	B. Swinbourn	single
b.1342	R. Benhale	E. de Clavering	widow
1343	J. Montagu	M. Monthermer	single
c.1343	T. Dagworth	C. of Ormond	widow
1345	T. Musgrave	I. Clifford	widow
c.1346	R. Basset	S. de Astley	single
1348	M. de Poynings	J. Molyms	widow
c.1349	G. Brian	E. Despenser	widow
c.1349	L. Poynings	I. Burghersh	widow
1351	J. Ufford	Alice	
c.1351	R. Hussee	M. St. Quentin	widow
1352	R. le Scrope	B. de la Pole	single
1354	G. de Lisle	E. de St. John	widow
1355	W. Manny	M. Segrave	widow
b.06/66	R. Cromwell	M. Bernake	single
1361	M. de la Pole	K. Wingfield	single
b.1365	J. Stryvelyn	J. Emeldon	single

² Widow of Edward, son and heir apparent of Thomas of Brotherton, earl of Norfolk.

³ Youngest daughter and coheir to Thomas of Brotherton, Earl of Norfolk.

⁴ G.E.C. vii, 150-51. There is a considerable amount of dispute about the timing and legality of this marriage. See Wentersdorf, 'Clandestine Marriages', 203-31.

⁵ Later changed his name to Burnell. G.E.C. ii, 434-35.

1370	W. Botreaux	E. Daubney	single
------	-------------	------------	--------

In the Period 1330-1377

J. Clifton	E. Cromwell	single
T. Bradeston	Agnes	
W. Huntingfield	E. Willoughby	single
J. Philbert	J. de Ufford	single
J. Philbert	M. de St. John	single
E. Montagu	Joan	

No Dates

J. Darcy	E. Heron	single
T. Bradeston	Isabel	
R. Cobham	J. de Berkley	single
W. Heron	Isabel	
N. Meinill	A. de Ros	single
T. Musgrave	M. de Ros	single
J. Norwich	Margery	
H. le Scrope	Joan or Agnes	
G. Talbot	A. Botiler	single
R. Swynnerton	Maud	
W. Aldeburgh	Elizabeth	
J. Bohun	Isabel ⁶	
J. Bohun	C. Filliol	single
R. Basset	A. Derby	single
R. Beauchamp	Margaret	
J. Hausted	Fina	
J. Grey	A. Marmion	single

⁶ Perhaps daughter of Sir Henry de Tregoz

APPENDIX 4 Wardships

p= part of the state
w= whole estate
d= dower
i= wardship due to idiocy

r= rent or 'lease at farm'
c= commitment (payments)
g= grant (free of all payments)
s= sale
a= appointment (stewardship)

E.= earl

Date	Name	Type	Estate	County
13/01/31	T. Bradeston	c	E. of Kent(p)	Gloucester
18/02/31	R. Chandos	a	E. of Pembroke(p)	Wales ¹
21/03/31	W. Clinton	c	E. of Pembroke(p)	Kent
03/05/31	W. Montagu	c	E. of Kent(p)	Somerset
14/06/31	R. Ufford	s	B. Davilliers(p)	Suff/Dors ²
17/11/31	W. Bohun	g	E. of Kent(p)	Hampshire ³
15/12/31	T. Bradeston	g	J. Giffard(w)	Gloucs/Wilts
				Somerset
				Dorset
				Surrey
				Oxford
				Wales
22/07/32	W. Montagu	g	Mary, his aunt(p)	Somerset ⁴
27/10/32	J. Darcy	g	T. Swynburn(p)	Essex
				Suffolk
30/10/32	G. Talbot	a	J. de Wysham(p)	Gloucester
01/07/33	R. Ufford	c>g	J. St. Philbert(w)	Norf/Suff
				Essex/Gloucs
				Berks/Oxford
31/04/33	W. Clinton	c	E. of Pembroke(p)	Middlesex
19/06/34	H. Grosmont	g	E. of Pembroke(p)	Wales
06/01/34	T. Bradeston	g	J. Westcote(p/i)	Hampshire
21/02/34	W. Montagu	g	J. de Romesye(w)	Hampshire
30/04/34	T. Bradeston	c>g	E. Mortimer(p)	Hereford
02/05/34	H. de Frene	c	E. Mortimer(p)	Hereford
11/07/34	J. Verdon	c	T. de Burgh(p)	Cambridge ⁵
23/09/34	G. Talbot	c	R. de Abberbury(p)	Northampton
04/01/35	W. Montagu	c	E. of Pembroke(p)	Hampshire
05/04/36	W. Bohun	g	E. Mortimer(p)	Salop/Staffs
				Gloucester
30/05/36	J. Grey	g	R. de Moreby(w)	
03/06/36	W. Montagu	s/g	E. Mortimer(p)	Hants/Worcs
20/06/36	W. de Mauny	g	E. of Athol(p)	Norfolk

¹ Regranted to William Aune 6 March 1331.

² By bill of the treasurer.

³ This was originally granted to Montagu, but then by mistake also granted to Bohun. The latter was allowed to keep the wardship and Montagu was compensated with the wardship of the manor of Hurcott (Somerset) also part of the estate of the earl of Kent. CPR 1330-34, 319.

⁴ Later granted to Montagu and the heirs of his body. See Appendix 2.

⁵ Held with Thomas, his brother.

23/09/36	W. Bohun	c	E. Mortimer(p)	Hereford ⁶
19/03/37	W. Montagu	g	J. de Erlegh(w)	Somerset
03/09/37	W. de Mauny	g	E. de Benstede(w)	Essex
03/11/37	R. Cobham	c	J. Dokesworth(w)	Hertford
22/11/39	W. Clinton	s	T. de Furnyvale	York/Staffs Derby
08/02/40	W. de Manny	c	J. de Brumpton	
08/01/41	T. Bradeston	c	W. de la More(w)	Gloucester
18/05/41	R. Burghcher	c	J. Amory(w)	Essex/Beds ⁷ Leicester
10/10/41	J. Darcy	g	M. Swynburn(wife)(w)	Essex Suffolk
06/09/41	W. Bohun	c	E. Mortimer(p)	Hants/Wales ⁸
06/05/42	G. Brian	c>g	R. Butler(w)	Salop/Beds Wilts Warwick Staff/Lincs
29/05/43	J. Stryvelyn	g	E. of Athol(p)	York
15/04/45	T. Bradeston	c	C. Hykeling(w)	Suffolk ⁹
02/04/46	J. Darcy	c	E. of Ormond(p)	Ireland ¹⁰
12/07/46	R. Ufford	r	J. de Bernak(p)	Norfolk
20/12/46	G. Brian	s	R. Pavely(w)	Notts Northants
26/05/47	R. Beauchamp	c	H. de St. Quintin(w)	Wilts/Dorset Berks/York Gloucester ¹¹
04/12/47	G. Brian	c>s	R. Abbenhale(p)	
b. 1348	J. Beauchamp		J. Lovel	
12/03/49	W. de Mauny	c	H. Despenser(p)	Oxford
01/06/49	R. Beauchamp	g	R. de Saint Crois(w)	Bedford
26/04/49	G. Brian	g	W. de Welle(w)	Cambs/Wales Essex/Suff
30/05/49	G. Brian	g	E. of Pembroke(p)	Surrey
02/11/49	R. Basset	c	E. Botreaux(p)	Warwick ¹²
22/11/49	T. Ughtred	c	J. le Conestable(p)	York
03/05/50	J. Grey	c	I. Lovel(p)	Oxford
13/10/50	J. Bohun	c	J. de Insula(p)	Hampshire ¹³
14/10/50	M. Poynings	c	W. Bonnet(p)	Suffolk ¹⁴
20/10/50	T. Bradeston	c	H. Welyngton(p)	Gloucester
20/10/50	G. Brian	c	H. Despener(p)	Wales
03/01/51	W. Clinton	a	W. de Sevanche(w)	
28/07/51	W. Clinton	c	A. Twitham(w)	Kent
03/03/51	T. Ughted	c	J. le Conestable	York
22/10/53	G. Brian	c	O. de Dynham(w)	Devon
20/06/57	R. Cobham	s	W. Criketot(p)	Suffolk
14/07/57	T. Brewes	c	J. Brewes(p/i)	Surrey

⁶ Bohun surrendered it to the king on 17 July 1342. CPR 1340-43, 489.

⁷ Dower granted to him on 1 May 1346. CFR 1337-47, 469.

⁸ Held with wife.

⁹ Held with Maurice de Berkeley

¹⁰ To be paid at the exchequer of Dublin

¹¹ In 1350, this was changed to a sale for the nominal amount of £10. CFR 1347-56, 245. Paid 20 October 1350. E401/404

¹² To be paid at the wardrobe

¹³ Held along with Joan, his daughter, late the wife of John de Insula of Gatecounge, and Geoffrey de Rouclee.

¹⁴ Paid at the wardrobe.

22/05/57	Ra. Stafford	c	E. of Gloucester(p)	Bucks
13/05/58	Ra. Stafford	c	E. of Desmond(p)	Ireland
				/England
10/06/60	G. Brian	g	R. Mortimer(p)	Som/Devon
20/11/60	R. Beauchamp	c	T. Bradeston(p)	Essex/Surrey
10/02/61	R. Beauchamp	c	T. Bradeston(p)	Scotland ¹⁵
24/11/62	W. Heron	c	T. Heton(p)	Northumb ¹⁶
14/11/63	T. Ughtred	c	W. Faucomberge(p)	York
14/05/68	G. Brian	c	J. Bohun(p)	Lincoln
10/05/68	R. Ufford	g	C. de Clifton(p/d)	Norfolk
23/10/68	R. Cromwell	c	M. Ufford(d)	Lincoln
27/02/69	L. Poynings	c	N. Eliot(p?/i)	Sussex
b. 1370	R. Basset		J. Mowbray	
07/02/71	L. Poynings	c	W. Ferrers(w)	Essex/Cambs
				Oxford/Lincs
				Bucks/York
				Salop/Staffs
				Northants
				Leics/Lancs
				Warwick
07/08/72	R. le Scrope	c	R. Tybetot(w)	Beds/Bucks
				Glouc/London
				Essex/Kent
				Rutl/Lincs
				Leics/Wilts
				York/Glouce
				Nott/Suff
12/06/74	R. le Scrope		T. Bradeston(w)	Glouce/Essex
				Surrey/Wilts
				Hants/Worcs

¹⁵ This was surrendered by Beauchamp and then granted on 25 November 1363 to one John de Coupland. CFR 1356-68, 270.

¹⁶ Held along with Joan Heton, Edward Letham, and Thomas de Clifford.

APPENDIX 5a Annuities Granted¹

Type

a= straight annuity
 lf= until lands and rents in fee
 lt= until land and rents in tail male
 len= until land and rents entailed
 ll= until lands and rents for life or otherwise
 limited term
 3rd= third penny connected with the grant of an earldom

Source

e= exchequer
 i= issues from towns, counties, customs, alien religious lands
 o= other

Other

arranged= lands or other compensation
 arranged for most or all of the amount
 at the time of the grant of the
 annuity or soon thereafter (usually
 expectancies)
 >= later changed to
 n/a= not applicable

Date	Name	Amount	Type	Source	Land Grants ²
27/03/32	H. Grosmont	500m	a	e	n/a ³
03/04/35	W. Manny	100	lf	e	100m ⁴
08/06/35	R. Cobham	100m>400m	ll	e>i	119
15/03/37	R. Beauchamp	100m	len	e>i	none
16/03/37	H. Audley	100	lt	e	90 ⁵
		20	3 rd	i	n/a

¹ Two annuities to John Grey, one in 1345 and one in 1347, have been omitted because it is unclear if the individual noted was the right John Grey (ie. of Rotherfield). CPR 1343-45, 570; E403/341 (10 May 1348).

² That is, within the reign, which were not recalled and to the approximate value of the annuity. It was usually clear when land was fulfilling the terms of an annuity, as it was mentioned as such in the text of the grant. For example, see the grant to Walter Manny. CPR 1334-38, 91.

³ Although, on 31 January 1333, the source for this was changed from the exchequer to the same amount which Roger Grey paid for the lordship of Abergavenny during the minority of the earl of Pembroke's heir. In June of 1334, Grosmont was made custodian of the lordship during the minority, effectively making it the wardship of part of the estate. CPR 1330-34, 265, 397, 553; see also Fowler, King's Lieutenant, 28; Somerville, Duchy of Lancaster, 38.

⁴ It is difficult to know from the wording of this grant if the both the annuity and the lands were to be in fee, or just the lands. CPR 1334-38, 90.

⁵ Annuity to be paid to Audley, his wife, and the heirs male of his body. CPR 1334-38, 414-15.

16/03/37	W. Montagu	1000m	lt	o	arranged ⁶
		20	3rd	i	n/a
18/03/37	H. Grosmont	1000m	ll	i	72 7 6 ⁷
		20	3rd	i	n/a
19/03/37	W. Bohun	1000	lt	i	arranged ⁸
		20	3rd	i	n/a
19/03/37	R. Ufford	253 6 8	lt	e>i	arranged ⁹
		20	3rd	i	n/a
19/03/37	E. Montagu	100	lt	e	none
20/03/37	W. Clinton	500m	lt	i	arranged ¹⁰
		20	3rd	i	n/a
22/08/37	J. Stryvelyn	200m	lf	e>i	61 13 4 ¹¹
12/03/38	W. Manny	100	lt	e	none
16/10/39	T. Bradeston	500m	lf	e>i	none ¹²
11/11/39	J. de Norwich	50m	lf	e	50m ¹³
b.1340	G. Brian	40>80	ll	e	60
20/10/40	R. Burghcher	100	ll	o	none ¹⁴
1343	J. Beauchamp	20>280	ll	e>i	none ¹⁵
b. 1344	J. Darcy	183 6 8	lf	i	arranged ¹⁶
23/03/47	M. Poynings	200	ll	e	none
01/04/47	H. Grosmont	1000	a	i	n/a ¹⁷

⁶ It is hard to tell from the wording of this grant if the annuity is for heirs general or heirs male, though the lands granted are in tail male, so presumably it was in tail male. See CPR 1334-38, 426. The annuity was to be paid from the coinage of tin in the county of Cornwall. CPR 1334-38, 427.

⁷ Annuity and lands for the life of his father only. CPR 1334-38, 400.

⁸ Annuity to be paid to Bohun and the heirs male of his body. There were also other important provisions on this grant. See CPR 1334-38, 416-17.

⁹ £133. 6s. 8d. until the arranged reversions came in and £120 to himself and his heirs male until other lands were found. CPR 1334-38 14.

¹⁰ Until arranged reversions came in. CPR 1334-38, 415.

¹¹ This annuity was in compensation for a grant of Scottish lands which had been seized back by the Scots and was to run until he or his heirs received compensation in land or rents. CPR 1334-38, 482.

¹² Annuity in fee. According to Smyth, this annuity continued to be paid until 1628. Smyth, Lives of the Berkeleys i, 284.

¹³ Until he or his heirs receive lands to a similar value.

¹⁴ This annuity was paid from the hanaper of the Chancery. CCR 1341-43, 46.

¹⁵ This goes through a number of changes before it reaches the final amount - some of which are discussed in Chapter Five. See pp. 135-36. The original £20 annuity was granted in fee, but by the time it was made up to £280 it was only for life. See E403/341 (20 June 1348); CPR 1350-54, 52.

¹⁶ This was actually a grant in recompense for the justiciarship of Ireland, which he had surrendered, but, as he was also granted reversions of lands in connection with this, one may see the annuity as more of an endowment than a simple fee for an office. CPR 1343-45, 208.

¹⁷ To help Grosmont pay for the £1000 yearly due to Queen Philippa for the castle of Pontefract. CPR 1348-50, 104;

20/03/47	T. Ughtred	200>100	11>a	e	n/a ¹⁸
06/09/48	Ra. Stafford	600m>1000m	11	i	none ¹⁹
24/08/49	H. Grosmont	20	3rd	i	n/a
13/01/50	G. Brian	200m	11	e>i	none
1352	R. Beauchamp	100	a	e	n/a
24/08/52	T. Holand	100m	a	e	n/a ²⁰
13/05/54	T. Bradeston	100m	a	i	n/a
30/11/54	M. de la Pole	400m	a	i	n/a ²¹
26/01/56	W. Aldeburgh	100m	11	i	none
20/11/62	H. le Scrope	200m	1f	e	none ²²
28/01/70	T. Musgrave	100m	a	e	n/a
06/10/76	R. Beauchamp	100m	a	i	n/a

Fowler, King's Lieutenant, 28, 72; Somerville, Duchy of Lancaster, 35.

¹⁸ This starts off being an annuity until lands and rents for life come in, with Ughtred promising to provide twenty men-at-arms. However, by the time this grant is changed to peacetime amount of 100 marks, without any further commitment for men at arms, no further mention of prospective land grants was made. Compare E403/344 (2 May 1348); CPR 1358-61, 430; E403/408 (5 May 1361).

¹⁹ Again with the proviso that he provide sixty, and later one hundred, men-at-arms and until lands and rents came in. RDP, v, 46. About the treatment of these types of grant as endowment, see footnote 16. See also Given-Wilson, English Nobility, 154-55.

²⁰ For the life of his wife, or until her brother, the earl of Kent, died without heirs of his body. The earl died in December of the same year. See CPR 1350-54, 312.

²¹ This was held jointly with his father. See CCR 1354-60, 120.

²² Annuity for himself and his heirs.

APPENDIX 5b
Examples of Assignments

Sources: E106, E122, E207, E208, E356, E372, E401, E403, E404

(a)= arrears included in payment (r)= worked out "pro rata"
(f)= future (p)= part payment
> = changed to B.= Bishop

- "Date" (in exchequer columns) refers to date enroled
- break in columns means break in payments
- *italics* indicates doubt concerning identity of source

ANNUITANT: Hugh de Audley (d.1347)

Date: 17 March 1337

Amount: £100

Source: Exchequer

Land grant: 25/9/37 - manors of Kirkby upon Ashfield
(Nottingham) and Eckington
(Derbyshire) (£90)

	Issue	Date	Amount	Receipt	Source
11M	E403/298	24/10/37	50		10th+15th
12E					
M	E403/302	23/11/38	10		cash
13E	E403/307	4/11/39	5		
M	E403/307	4/2/40	5		
14E					
M					
15E	E403/318	1/5/41	15		(a)
M	E403/322	13/11/41	5		
16E	E403/326	3/6/42	5	E401/368	fine
M	E403/329	5/5/43	5		
17E	E403/329	23/7/43	5		
M	E403/330	10/2/44	5		
18E					
M	E403/335	9/2/45	10		

ANNUITANT: Henry of Grosmont (d.1361)

Date: 27 March 1332

Source: Exchequer

Amount: 500 marks

Comment: 31/01/33 - annuity ends with the grant of the wardship
of Abergavenny

	Issue	Date	Amount	Receipt	Source
7M	E403/265	17/12/32	30 0 0	E401/308	fine
7E	E403/267	16/7/33	66 13 4	E401/311	10th+15th
					(a)
	E403/267	8/5/33	10 0 0	-	(a)
	E403/267	17/6/33	33 6 8	-	(a)
8M	E403/271	1/03/34	66 13 4	-	farm
10E	E403/288	14/5/36	300 0 0	-	fine(a)

28M|E403/371|13/11/53| 77 4 2.5|E401/422|prest(a)

ANNUITANT: Michael Poynings (d.1369)

Date: March 23, 1347

Amount: 200 marks

Source: Exchequer

	Issue	Date	Amount	Receipt	Source
21M	E403/340	6/11/47	66 13 4	E401/391	15th+10th
22E					
M					
23E	E403/347	1/5/49	66 13 4	E401/397	15th+10th
	E403/347	12/5/49	16 13 4	E401/397	15th+10th
	E403/349	1/3/50	66 13 4	E401/399	15th+10th
M	E403/349	1/3/50	50	E401/399	15th+10th(a)
24E	E403/355	2/12/50	39	E401/404	prest(a)
	E403/362	11/7/52	27 13 2	E401/413	15th+10th(a)
M	E403/355	2/12/50	66 13 4	E401/404	prest
25E					
M					
26E	E403/368	9/7/53	66 13 4	E401/419	15th+10th(a)
M	E403/362	11/7/52	39	E401/413	15th+10th(a)
27E					
M					
28E					
M	E403/375	21/10/54	66 13 4	E401/375	prest(a)
29E					
M	E403/378	21/12/55			
30E					
M					
31E	E403/387	24/04/57	20	E401/442	Chichester customs(a)
M	E403/388	5/10/57	80	E401/443	Chichester customs(a)
		1/3/58	100	E401/443	Chichester customs(a)
32E	E403/392	10/7/58	66 13 4	E401/446	Chichester customs(a)
M	E403/394	12/10/58	33 6 8	E401/449	Chichester customs(a)
		4/12/58	66 13 4	E401/449	Chichester customs(a)
33E	E403/397	6/5/59	60 8 10		(a)
			50 16 1		(a)
		9/7/59	44 11 7.5	E401/453	alien priory farm(a)
M	E403/398	20/1/60	62 10	E401/454	Chichester customs(a)
34E					
M	E403/403	3/2/61	23 6 8	E401/459	¹
35E					
M					
36E					
M	E403/412	11/11/62	86 10 11	E401/470	prest(a) ²
37E					
M	E403/417	28/10/63	100	E401/475	Chichester customs(a)

¹ Paid from the fine of the proctor of the Abbot of Fecamp and the payment of his farm, presumably for lands in Sussex.² Paid on November 13, 1362.

ANNUITANT: Guy Brian (d.1390)

Date: c. 1340

Amount: £40 > \$80

Source: Exchequer

	Issue	Date	Amount	Receipt	Source
14E	E403/309	27/5/40	20		St Briavel + Dean
M					
15E	E403/318	26/7/41	20	E401/363	clerical 10th
M	E403/322	19/1/42	20	E401/367	St Briavel + Dean
	E403/326	6/5/42	20	E401/368	St Briavel + Dean
16E					
M	E403/327	13/12/42	20	E401/370	St Briavel + Dean
17E	E403/329	4/7/43	20	E401/373	St Briavel + Dean
M					
18E					
M					
19E					
M	E403/330	23/10/45	20		
20E					
M					
21E					
M	E403/340	31/10/47	6 13 4		(a)
			20		
			20		
22E					
M	E403/344	11/10/48	20	E401/396	bailiwick
			20	E401/396	bailiwick
23E	E403/347	22/5/49	20		
			20		
23M	E403/349	13/2/50	20	E401/400	St Briavel + Dean
			20	E401/400	St Briavel + Dean
24E	E403/353	20/4/50	20		
			20		
M	E403/355	20/10/50	20	E401/404	³
			20	E401/404	⁴

1351 - payment of £20 residue of £80 annuity: grant of the farm of the castle of St Briavel and Dean seems to become a fixed source

25E	E403/356	3/6/51	10	E401/407	St Briavel + Dean
M					
26E	E403/359	2/4/52	10		
M	E403/365	29/10/52	10		
27E					
M					
28E	E403/374	20/5/54	35		(a)
M					
29E					
M	E403/378	12/2/56	20	E401/431	St Briavel + Dean

³ Paid from the triennial lay fifteenth and tenth in Cumberland and the payment by Brian for the custody of the lands of Robert de Abenhale and marriage of the heir.

⁴ As above.

30E	M	E403/387	17/2/57	40	E401/436	London custom(a) (f)
31E	M	E403/388	24/11/57	20	E401/443	⁵
32E	M					
33E	M	E403/397	6/6/59	20	E401/453	⁶
34E	M					
35E	M	E403/403	22/2/61	40	E401/459	(a)
	M	E403/409	22/11/61	20	E401/465	⁷
36E	M	E403/412	29/10/62	20	E401/470	⁸
37E	M	E403/417	29/10/63	20	E401/475	⁹
38E	M					
39E	M	E403/426	24/11/65	20	E401/484	St Briavel(p)
40E	M	E403/430	27/10/66	20	E401/488	St Briavel + Dean(p) ¹⁰
41E	M	E403/433	3/11/67	20	E401/491	¹¹
42E	M	E403/437	7/2/69	20	E401/495	¹²
43E	M	E403/439	8/2/70	20	E401/500	¹³

⁵ Paid from payments made by Brian for farms, arrears and other charges for the Castle of St. Briavel and Forest of Dean, arrears of the farm of the manor of Stoke Trister, as well as what John atte Hale owed for the custody of the temporalities of the Abbot of Bindon in Dorset.

⁶ Payment from charges owed by Brian for the forest of Bere (Hampshire) and the castle of St. Briavel and the Forest of Dean, as well as what the prior of the alien priory of Newnton Longville owed for his farm and what John Goah and David de St. Claire owed for the custody of the temporalities of the bishop of St. David's.

⁷ Payment from charges owed by Brian for the castle of St. Briavel and the Forest of Dean and the manor of Westcote (Surrey).

⁸ Payment from charges owed by Brian for the castle of St. Briavel and the Forest of Dean and diverse farms in Suthwell (Gloucestershire)

⁹ As footnote 8.

¹⁰ At least as listed in the Receipt rolls.

¹¹ Payment from charges owed by Brian for the castle of St. Briavel and the Forest of Dean and the money owed for the custody of the lands which were held by John Nerbert.

¹² Payment from charges owed by Brian for the castle of St. Briavel and the Forest of Dean and the money owed by John Tracey, lately sheriff of Gloucestershire, for the issues from his bailiwick.

¹³ Payment from charges owed by Brian for the castle of St. Briavel and the Forest of Dean and the money owed by John Poynz, lately sheriff of Gloucestershire, for the issues from his

44E	M	E403/441	7/2/71	20		
45E	M	E403/443	20/2/72	20	E401/507	14
46E	M	E403/447	5/3/72	13 10	E401/511	St Briavel + Dean(p)
47E	M					
48E	M	403/456	17/11/74	9 10 3 10	E401/518 E401/518	B. of Boston - debts B. of Boston - debts
49E	M	E403/459	23/10/75	6 10 13 10	E401/521 E401/521	15 16
		E403/459	24/10/75	3 10 10		(a) (a)
				10		(a)
		E403/459	20/2/76	6 10 7		(a) (a)
50E	M					
51E		E403/462	12/6/77	6 10	E401/524	(a) ¹⁷
		E403/462	12/6/77	13 10	E401/524	(a)

ANNUITANT: Robert Ufford (d.1369)

Date: March 18, 1337

Amount: £253. 6s. 8d.

Source: Exchequer

Land grant: Benhall manor (£133. 6s. 8d.)

unnamed lands (£120) - which later included the manor
of Dedham (Essex) and £11. 18s. 4d. in rent
connected with the manor of Combs (Suffolk)

	Issue	Date	Amount	Receipt	Source
11E	E403/294	6/5/37	126 13 4		
M	E403/298	12/2/38	107 11 10	E401/341	10th + 15th
12E					
M					
13E	E403/304	11/2/39	108 20	E401/348	18.

bailiwick. See also Issue Roll of Thomas de Brantingham (1370),
ed. F. Devon (London, 1835), 436.

¹⁴ As footnote 12.

¹⁵ Payment from charges owed by Brian for the castle of St.
Briavel and the Forest of Dean and debts owed by William Latimer,
lately sheriff of Gloucestershire.

¹⁶ As footnote 16.

¹⁷ Payment from charges owed by Brian for the castle of St.
Briavel and the Forest of Dean and from that which Hugh
Durbourgh, sheriff of Somerset, owed from the issues of his
bailiwick.

¹⁸ Paid from what John Harsyk, sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk,
owed for his account; from the 10th and 15th from the county of
Norfolk; and from Laurence de Stowe, bailiff of the liberty of
Queen Isabella, owed for various debts.

- in June of 1339, Suffolk asked for this to be converted to a grant out of the first farms and issues of the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk

	Reference	Amount			Comments
13E	E372/185/21/1	108	11	5.5	
M	E372/185/21/1	108	20		
14E					
M					
15E					
M	E372/186/22/1	432	6	8	(a)
16E					
M	E372/187/21/2	216	4	4	
17E					
M	E372/188/26/1ob	141	20		(p)
18E					
M					
19E	E372/190/16/1	177	2	9.5	(a)
M					
20E					
M					
21E					
M	E372/192/16/1	128			
22E					
M					
23E	E372/194/20/1ob	108	20		
M					
24E	E372/195/22/1ob	214	18	4	(a)
M					
25E					
M	E372/196/20/1	76	16	8	
26E					
M	E372/197/23/1	76	16	8	
27E	E372/198/17/2	38	6	8	
M	E372/198/17/1	38	6	8	
28E					
M	E372/200/17/2	76	16	8	
29E					
M					
30E					
M	E372/201/19/1	115	5		(a)
31E					
M	E372/202/19/2	76	16	8	
32E					
M	E372/203/19/2	76	16	8	
33E					
M	E372/204/19/1	76	16	8	
34E					
M	E372/205/17/1	76	16	8	
35E					
M	E372/206/19/1	76	16	8	
36E					
M	E372/207/19/1	76	16	8	
37E					
M	E372/208/18/1	76	16	8	
38E					
M	E372/209/24/1	76	16	8	

39E	E372/210/22/1ob	38	8	4
M	E372/210/22/2	38	8	4
40E				
M	E372/211/18/2	76	16	8
41E				
M	E372/212/22/1	76	16	8
42E				
M	E372/213/16/1	76	16	8

ANNUITANT: Roger Beauchamp (d. 1380)

Date: 15 March 1337

Amount: 100 marks

Source: Exchequer > farm of the town of Northampton (25 February 1338)

	Issue	Date	Amount	Receipt	Source
11E	E403/294	17/5/37	33 6 8		
12M	E403/298	16/12/37	20		
	E403/298	24/2/38	13 6 8		

Northampton

	Reference	Amount	Comments
12E			
M	E372/183/26/1ob	100m	
13E			
M	E372/184/18/2ob	100m	
14E			
M			
15E			
M			
16E			
M	E372/187/24/1ob	200m	(a)
	E372/187/24/2ob	100m	(a)
17E			
M	E372/188/23/1	100m	
	E372/188/23/2	100m	
18E			
M			
19E			
M	E372/190/18/2	100m	
20E			
M	E372/191/23/1	100m	
21E			
M	E372/192/14/2	100m	
22E			
M	E372/193/14/2	100m	
23E			
M	E372/194/24/2	100m	
24E			
M	E372/195/18/2	50m	
25E			
M	E372/196/24/2	150m	(a)

- on October 12, 1351, the king seems to begin to pay them a sum of 800 marks in exchange for the annuity. Payments made:

	Issue	Date	Amount	Receipt	Source
26M	E403/359	12/10/51	100 0 0	E401/410	loan
	E403/359	19/10/51	120 0 0		
	E403/359	20/10/51	80 0 0	E401/410	Boston customs
	E403/359	24/10/51	80 0 0		
	E403/359	29/11/51	149 13 4		
	E403/359	10/12/51	3 13 4		

ANNUITANT: Thomas Ughtred (d.1365)

Date: c.1347

Amount: £200>£100

Source: Exchequer

	Issue	Date	Amount	Receipt	Source
21M	E403/340	19/11/47	100	E401/391	knighting king's son
22E	E403/341	2/5/48	80	E401/394	clerical 10th York
M					
23E					
M	E403/349	21/10/49	200		(a) (f)
24E	E403/353	17/6/50	100	E401/401	15th+10th(a)
M	E403/355	2/12/50	66 13 4		
			39 2		(a)
25E					
M	E403/359	11/11/51	200	E401/410	19
26E					
M	E403/365	24/10/52	50	E401/416	clerical 10th York
27E	E403/373	18/10/53	100	E401/422	clerical 10th York
M					
28E	E403/374	4/7/54	100	E401/426	clerical 10th York
M	E403/375	6/11/54	100		
29E					
M	E403/378	1/12/56	100	E401/431	bailiwick
30E					
34M	E403/398	20/1/60	62 10	E401/454	Chichester customs(a)
35E	E403/408	5/5/61	100	E401/464	Hull customs(a)
M	E403/409	2/11/61	100	E401/465	Hull customs
		12/11/61	70	E401/465	(a) ²⁰
36E	E403/410	11/5/62	5	E401/467	sheriff's account
			25	E401/467	prest
			23 7 8	E401/467	Hull customs
	E403/410	12/5/62	6 8	E401/467	his issues as sheriff
M					
37E	E403/416	21/4/63	50	E401/472	his issues as sheriff

¹⁹ This ends up as a fictitious loan and was finally filled on 16 May 1352.

²⁰ Paid from the customs and subsidies of the port of Hull; from that which John Moryn and his wife owe for the occupation of an unnamed manor.

M	E403/417	1/5/63	10	7	8	E401/472	²¹
		10/11/63	50			E401/475	Newcastle customs

ANNUITANT: Thomas Musgrave (d.1385)

Date: 28 November 1370

Amount: 100 marks

Source: Exchequer

	Issue	Date	Amount	Receipt	Source
45E	E403/443	30/6/71	22 8 5	E401/505	bailiwick(r)
			10 18 3	E401/505	bailiwick(f)
M					
46E	E403/446	25/6/72	55 15 1	E401/508	bailiwick
M					
47E	E403/449	20/5/73	44 16 2	E401/512	bailiwick
M					
48E	E403/451	9/2/74	66 13 4	E401/514	Berwick customs
M					
49E	E403/458	5/6/75	21 17 2	E401/520	Hull + Berwick customs
			44 6 2	E401/520	Hull + Berwick customs
M	E403/459	18/2/76	21 17 6	E401/521	bailiwick issues
					/Berwick customs
50E	E403/460	23/6/76	21 17 2	E401/522	bailiwick issues
					/Berwick customs ²²
M	E403/461	3/11/76	21 17 2	E401/523	forest issues
					/farm of manors
51E	E403/462	9/5/77	21 17 2	E401/524	bailiwick issues
					/farm of manors

ANNUITANT: Henry le Scrope (d.1392)

Date: 28 November 1362

Amount: 200 marks

Source: Exchequer

	Issue	Date	Amount	Receipt	Source
36M					
37E					
M					
38E	E403/418	29/4/64	66 13 4	E401/477	Pontiou issues
M					
39E	E403/422	29/5/65	66 13 4		
M	E403/426	24/10/65	66 13 4		
40E	E403/428	9/5/66	66 13 4	E401/486	Pontiou issues
M	E403/430	23/10/66	40		
	E403/430	26/11/66	26 13 4	E401/488	Great Jersey customs
41E	E403/431	5/7/67	66 13 4	E401/490	Boston customs
M	E403/433	29/10/67	66 13 4	E401/491	Hull customs

²¹ Paid from what Richard de Ravenere, clerk of the hanaper, owed from the issues; what Ughtred owed from the forfeit of bread in the county of York.

²² The payment from the Berwick customs later ended up as a fictitious loan, Musgrave finally being satisfied of this amount in 1377.

42E	E403/434	4/5/68	66	13	4	E401/494	Pontiou issues
M	E403/437	17/10/68	66	13	4	E401/495	Pontiou issues
43E	E403/438	5/5/69	66	13	4	E401/499	Boston customs
M	E403/439	8/11/69	66	13	4	E401/500	Pontiou issues
							/alien priory
44E	E403/440	20/9/70	47	14	7	E401/501	prest
M	E403/441	28/11/70	66	13	4	E401/504	Hull customs
			66	13	4	E401/504	Boston customs
45E							
M	E403/444	13/11/71	133	6	8	E401/505	Southampton customs
46E	E403/446	7/7/72	66	13	4		
M	E403/447	12/11/72	66	13	4		
47E	E403/449	14/5/73	66	13	4		
M	E403/451	1/2/74	66	13	4		
48E							
M	E403/456	10/11/74	133	6	8		
49E	E403/458	1/6/75	66	13	4	E401/520	debt
M	E403/459	3/11/75	33	6	8	E401/521	10th+15th
		7/4/76	20			E401/521	farm of alien church
			13	6	8	E401/521	bailiwick
50E	E403/460	5/07/76	66	13	4	E401/522	custody of land
M							
51E							

ANNUITANT: Guy de Brian (d.1390)

Date: 13 January 1350

Amount: 200 marks

Source: Exchequer > Alien Priorities of Otterton and Newtown
Longville > Counties of Somerset and Dorset

Exchequer

	Issue	Date	Amount	Receipt	Source
24E	E403/353	20/4/50	66 13 4	E401/401	London customs
M	E403/355	20/10/50	66 13 4	E401/404	(p) 10th+15th/custody

Newtown Longville

	Reference	Amount	Comments
25E	E372/197/33/2ob	23 6 8	(a) ²³
M			
26E			
M			
27E			
M	E372/198/1/1ob	23 6 8	(a)
28E			
M	E372/200/1/2ob	35	(a)
29E			
M	E372/201/1/2ob	23 6 8	(a)
30E	E372/202/2/2	11 13 4	
M	E106/9/27/7	11 13 4	
31E			
M	E106/9/27/6	23 6 8	(a)

²³ See also 26 April 1351 (E106/9/27/)1.

32E	E106/9/27/5	11	13	4	
M	E106/9/27/4	5	6	8	(p)
	E106/9/27/3	6	6	8	(p)
33E	E106/9/27/2	11	13	4	

Ottertton

	Reference	Amount	Comments
25E			
M			
29E			
M	E372/200/3/2ob	440	(a)
		110	(a) ²⁴

Somerset and Dorset

	Reference	Amount	Comments
34M		100m	
35E	E372/206/34/2	80m	
M			
36E			
M	E372/207/31/1	200m	
37E			
M	E372/208/33/1	200m	
38E			
M	E372/209/33/1	200m	
39E			
M			
40E			
M	E372/210/29/2	400m	(a)
41E			
M			
42E			
M			
43E			
M	E372/213/29/2	400m	(a)
44E	E372/215/31/1	300m	(a)
M			
45E	E372/216/31/2	114m	(a)
M	E372/217/32/1	124	(a)
46E			
M			
47E			
M	E372/218/29/2	220 12	(a)
48E	E372/219/32/2	100m	
M			
49E			
M	E372/220/33/2	200m	
50E			
M	E372/221/31/2	200m	

²⁴ On 2 February 1362 there is also an order for payment by the prior of any arrears to Brian (E106/9/27/8).

APPENDIX 5c
Annuity Payment Rates¹

- sums rounded to the nearest pence
- percentages rounded to the nearest decimal point
- underlined figures indicated overpayment
- *figures in italics* indicate estimates

i) Exchequer Assignments²

Annuitant	Duration	Expected ³			Paid			%
		£	s	d	£	s	d	
Grosmont	3/32-1/33	283	2	1	583	17	6	<u>206</u>
Cobham	6/35-10/61	438	5		600			<u>137</u>
Beauchamp, R	3/37-2/38	66	13	4	66	13	4	100
Ufford, R	3/37-6/39	506	13	4	342	6	10	68
Audley, H	3/37-11/47	150			120			80
Stryvelyn	8/37-11/39	266	13	4	227	19	3	86
Manny	3/38-1/72	3400			3001	17	1	88 ⁴
Bradeston	10/39-4/40	166	13	4	166	13	4	100 ⁵
Brian	1340-6/77	940			885	13	4	94 ⁶
Poynings, M	3/47-3/69	2933	6	8	1367	9	4	47
Ughtred	1347-5/65	2900			1732	5	6	60 ⁷
Beauchamp, J	12/48-5/49	90			150			<u>170</u>
Brian	1/50-10/50	133	6	8	133	6	8	100
Scrope, H	11/62-6/77	1933	6	8	1647	14	7	85
Musgrave	11/70-6/77	433	6	8	354	3	7	82
Total		14641	7	1	11380		4	78

¹ The following tables have been compiled from PRO document classes: E106 (Alien Priorities), E122 (Customs Accounts), E356 (Customs Accounts), E372 (Pipe Rolls), E401 (Receipt Rolls), and E403 (Issue Rolls).

² Three exchequer annuities have been omitted from this list because they were obviously cancelled after only a few terms payment to be replaced by other sources - namely the grants to Walter Manny (04/35), Edward Montagu (19/03/37), and Roger Beauchamp (c. 1352). See Appendix 5a.

³ These are, obviously, estimates. Where no other evidence was forthcoming, it has been assumed that payment would start on an annuity the term following the making of the actual grant and would end in the term of the cessation of the grant or the death of the annuitant. As a result such estimates can, at times, be at least two terms out. Where considerable guess-work has been employed, the numbers have been placed in *italics*.

⁴ £2100 in arrears paid in forgiveness of debts. CCR 1360-64, 81.

⁵ This 500 mark annuity ran for half a year, which seems to correspond to the 250 marks (£166. 13. 4d.) paid out.

⁶ There is no official record as to when this annuity starts, so this number has been calculated from the first payment.

⁷ There is no official record as to when this annuity starts, so this number has been calculated from the first payment.

ii) Source based assignments

Annuitant	Duration	Expected			Paid			%
		£	s	d	£	s	d	
Clinton	3/37-8/54	5666	13	4	4174	9		74
Bohun, W	3/37-9/60	17010	6	3	14606	15		86 ⁸
Grosmont	3/37-9/45	5666	13	4	4730		4	83 ⁹
Montagu, W	3/37-1/44	140			120			86
Ufford	3/37-11/69	650			565			87
Audley, H	3/37-11/47	210			200			95
Bohun	3/37-9/60	470			444			94
Grosmont	3/37-3/61	680			270			40
Beauchamp, R	2/38-10/51	900			1000			111
Cobham	9/38-11/61	3220			2781	10		86
Ufford, R	6/39-11/69	5166	5		3195	18	7	62
Stryvelyn	11/39-6/77	4454			3029	2	1	68
Manny	11/39-1/72	1650			1575			95
Bradeston	4/40-8/60	10000			3686	9	4	37
Burghcher	12/40-1349	850			750			88
Darcy	1344-5/47	317	18	4	222	11	8	70
Darcy	1344-5/47	92	15		73			76
Beauchamp, J	10/45-10/46	30			30			100
Stafford, Ra	9/48-8/72	14800			8245	6	8	56 ¹⁰
Beauchamp, J	5/49-12/60	3220			2660			83
Grosmont	8/49-3/61	240			200			83
Brian	10/50-6/77	1620			1290			80
Brian	11/50-6/77	3600			2403	12		67
Bradeston	5/54-8/60	400			333	6	8	83
De la Pole	11/54-6/77	8666	13	4	3609	6	8	42
Aldeburgh	1/56-6/77	1400			1333	6	8	95
Beauchamp, R	10/76-6/77	66	13	4	65	7	11	98
Total		91187	17	11	61594	3	7	68

⁸ £810 of this was paid through the exchequer. See E403/302 (6 November and 23 December 1338)

⁹ £400 of this was paid through the exchequer. See E403/302 (23 December 1338).

¹⁰ Payments stop in 1362, probably because of peace.

APPENDIX 6
Major Offices held
(1330-77)

Sources: The Complete Peerage, The Dictionary of National Biography; as checked against the PRO published documents (Patent Rolls, Close Rolls, etc.)

- This is meant to be an illustrative, rather than comprehensive, list of offices held.
- Major offices are defined as those of the level of sheriff and above.
- Unless end date present, date in brackets indicates year first held.

Aton, William: Sheriff of County York (1368-70, 1372-73)
 Beauchamp, John: Admiral of the Fleet off Calais (1349)
 Captain of Calais (1355)
 Admiral of the Western Seas (1355)
 Admiral for the North, South and West (1360)
 Constable of Dover Castle and Warden of
 the Cinque Ports (1360)
 Beauchamp, Roger: Captain of Calais (1372)
 Lord Chamberlain of the Household (1376-77)
 Bohun, William: Constable of England (1338)
 King's Lieutenant in Brittany (1342)
 Warden of the Scottish Marches (1350)
 Admiral of the Fleet in the North (1351-
 53)
 Bouchier, Robert: Lord Chancellor (1340-41)
 Bradeston, Thomas: Constable of Gloucester Castle (1330, 1338-
 60)
 Brian, Guy: Governor of St. Briavel's Castle and the warden
 of the Forest of Dean (1341-86)
 Ambassador to the Pope (1361)
 Admiral of the Fleet (1369)
 Bulmer, Ralph: Sheriff of York (1330-32)
 Clinton, William: Justice of Chester (1330-33)
 Justice of Kent (1332-54)
 Constable of Dover Castle and warden of
 the Cinque Ports (1330-43)
 Admiral of the West (1333-35)
 Cobham, Reginald: Admiral of the Fleet for the West (1344,
 1348)
 Marshal of the Prince's army at Poitiers
 (1356)
 Constable of the Tower of London for life
 Dagworth, Thomas: Lieutenant for the Earl of Brittany (1346)
 King's Lieutenant and Captain in Brittany
 (1347)
 Darcy, John: Justicar of Ireland (1332-37, 1340-44)
 Steward of the King's Household (1337-40)
 Royal Chamberlain (1341-46)
 Constable of Nottingham Castle (1344-47)
 Constable of the Tower of London (1346-47)
 Grey, John: Steward of the Household (1350-56)

- Grosmont, Henry: Admiral of the Fleet in the South (1351)
 Steward of England (1345)
 Captain General in Scotland (1336)
 King's Lieutenant in Flanders and Calais (1348)
 Admiral of the Fleet south and West of the
 Thames (1350-51)
 Lieutenant and Captain in Duchy of Bretagne
 (1351)
- Hausted, John: Seneschal of Gascony (c.1339)
- Heron, William: Keeper of Berwick-upon-Tweed (1350)
- Holand, Thomas: Lieutenant and Captain in the Duchy of
 Brittany (1354-56)
 Keeper of the Channel Islands (1356)
 Keeper of Saint Sauvier (1357-60)
 Lieutenant and Captain in the Duchy of
 Normandy (1359-60)
 Captain and Lieutenant in France and Normandy
 (1360)
- Ingham, Oliver: Steward of the Duchy of Aquitaine (c.1331-43)
- Kerdeston, Roger: Sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk (1331-32)
 Keeper of Norwich castle (1331)
 Custodians of the coasts of Norfolk and
 Suffolk (1332)
- Manny, Walter: Custodian of Harlech Castle and Sheriff of
 Merioneth for life (1332)
 Marshal of the King's Marshalsea
 Admiral of the Northern Fleet (1337, 1348)
- Musgrave, Thomas: Deputy sheriff of Westmorland (1339)
 Custody of Appleby Castle (1343-45)
 Keepers of the Western March of Scotland (1346)
 Keeper of Berwick-upon-Tweed (1347)
 Sheriff of York (1359, 1362, 1363, 1364)
 Escheator of Yorkshire, Northumberland, Cumberland
 and Westmorland (1368-71)
- Montagu, Edward: Custodian of the Coast of Norfolk (1356)
- Montagu, William: King of the Isle of Man (1333)
 Custodian of the Channel Islands (1333-37)
 Constable of the Tower (1335)
 Admiral of the Western Fleet (1337)
 Marshal of England (1338)
 King of the Isle of Man (c.1340)
- Norwich, John: Admiral of the Coast from the Thames Northward
 (1335-37)
- Pole, Michael de la: Admiral of the Northern fleet (1376)
- Ros, John de: Admiral of the Northern Fleet (1336)
- Scrope, Henry le: Warden of Calais, Merk and Guisnes (1361)
 Warden of the Western March (1370)
 Governor of Calais
 Steward of the Household (1371)
- Scrope, Richard le: Treasurer (1371-75)
 Joint Warden of the West Marches (1375)
- Stafford, Ralph: Steward of the King's Household (1341)
 Seneschal of Aquitaine (1345-46)
 Joint Marschal of the King's Army in France
 (1360)
- Stryvelyn, John: Sheriff of Edinburgh and Custodian of the

Castle (1335)¹

Custodian of Berwick-upon-Tweed (1345-46)

Ufford, John: Warden of Maritime land for Norfolk (1346)

Ufford, Robert: Keeper of the Forest this side Trent (1330)

Steward of the Household (1336-37)

Admiral of the Northern Fleet (1337, 1344)

Marshal of the Army (1346)

Joint Marshal of the Army (1356)

Ughtred, Thomas: Warden of Scarborough Castle (1321)

Keeper of the Castle and Honor of

Pickering (1322)

Admiral of the Northern Fleet (1336)

Keeper of the Town of Perth (1337-39)

¹ Also appointed Sheriff of Northumberland in 1343 but declined, perhaps because of ill health. G.E.C. xii:1, 407.

APPENDIX 7
Extracts from Court Cases
Illustrating Contemporary Reaction
To Edward III's Endowment Programme

i) Claims concerning the Rights of a Wife

CP40/312/446 (Michaelmas 11 Edward III) (see pp. 169-70)

(Shropshire) William de Bohun, earl of Northampton, and Elizabeth, his wife, through William de Boxsted, their attorney, sought versus Joan who was the wife of Roger de Mortimer, the late earl of March, a third part of the manors of Dolforwyn, Bettws, Garthmyl, Penrhyn, Aberbechan, Garthgelin, Llanllwchaiarn, Rundoedelew, Aberhafesp, Edeffryn, Llanitheon, Tregynon, Launcothelan, Manafon, Gaynong, Penebont, Lees, Maunans, Llan, Uchweldrefbettons, Kylkethwyn, Pennowern, Nenee, Ekil, Eberrew, Bryncae-maes-hir, Rallussa, Eueynor, Llanfair, Egynae, Kilgeygan, Llanmerewig, Broniyond, Bolbro, Bryntalch, Llandyssil, Newtown, Leyrwyk and Tolnetun with appurtenances as the dower of the said Elizabeth by the endowment of Edmund de Mortimer, formerly her husband etc.

And Joan through Richard de Estham, her attorney, came and said that she held the aforesaid manors by the name of the castle of Dolforwyn and the entire land of Bettws with all its appurtenances to the end of her life by the grant and demise of Edmund de Mortimer, lord of Wigmore, and put forth here a certain deed under the name of the said Edmund which showed that the said Edmund granted, demised and surrendered to the said Joan the said castle and the whole land to hold by the said Joan for her whole life and obliged him and his heirs to warranty in the said form. . .

ii) Claims concerning forfeited lands

CP40/354/362 (Easter 22 Edward III) (see pp. 173-74)

(Northamptonshire) John, son of Richard de Grey of Codnor, through Robert de Keworth, his attorney, sought versus Walter de Manny the manor of Overstone with appurtenances as his right and inheritance and in which the said Walter does not have entry except according to the disseize which Cristina de Mareys thence unjustly and without judgement made against John de Grey, ancestor of the said John, son of Richard whose heir he is after the father etc. And whence it was said that the said John, ancestor, was seised of the said manor with appurtenances in his lordship as of fee and right in the time of the father in the time of King Henry, ancestor to the present king, taking thence profits to the value etc. And from the said John, ancestor, the right descended to a certain Richard as son and heir. And from the same Richard the right descended to John as son and heir who now seeks it. And in which etc. And thence he produced suit.

And Walter through William de Lupwyk, his attorney, came. And he said that the lord king, because of the good and laudable service which the said Walter had given already for a long time to him, gave and granted to the same Walter the said manor with appurtenances to have and to hold to the same Walter and his heirs together with knights fees and advowsons

of churches and all other [rights] whatsoever belonging to that manor from the lord king and his heirs and other chief lords of that fee through services and customs owed in perpetuity to the value of one hundred marks of land per annum. . .

iii) Claims concerning expectancies

CP40/366/112 (Trinity 25 Edward III) (see pp. 176-77)

(Suffolk) Robert de Benhale, knight, and Eva, his wife, through William de Bergh, their attorney, sought against Robert de Ufford, earl of Suffolk, the manor of Benhall with appurtenances which Guy de Ferre held from John de Claveryng, father of the said Eva, whose heir she is, and which ought to revert to Robert and Eva as their escheat because the said Guy died without heirs. And thence the same Robert de Benhale and Eva said that the said Guy held the aforesaid manor with appurtenances from the said John de Claveryng, father of the said Eva, whose heir she is, through homage, pledge, [etc.] . . . through which services the same John de Claveryng, father etc., was seised through the hand of the said Guy as through the hand truly held, namely of the said homage and pledge as of fee and right as of other services in his lordship as of fee and right in the time of peace in the time of King Edward, father of the present lord king. And from the said John, father etc., the right descended to the said Eva who now sought likewise as daughter and heir. And because etc. And thence they produced suit.

And the earl through John Waryn, his attorney, came. And he defended his right which etc. And he said that the present lord king through his charter granted and confirmed a certain manor of Benhall with appurtenances which Eleanor who was wife of Guy de Ferre holds to the end of her life. And which after the death of the said Eleanor ought to revert to the king and his heirs after the death of the same aforesaid earl and the male heirs arisen from his body [to whom] it remains to have and to hold together with members and hamlets and knights fees . . . and all other rights pertaining to the said manor of Benhall wherever and whatsoever without appurtenances at the value of £133 6s 8d per annum with casual profits; through which the same earl after the death of the said Eleanor by virtue of the grant of the lord king entered into the said manor of Benhall and was seised [of it] from him whence he said that he held the said manor to himself and his male heirs arisen from his body by the grant of the lord king in the said form . . .

iv) Claims concerning the rights of the heir of a New Man

CP40/320/448(ob) (Michaelmas 13 Edward III) (see pp. 179-82)

(Hereford) Gilbert Talbot through John Lucas, his attorney, sought versus Ralph de Wilington and Eleanor, his wife, the castle of Carreg Cennan and the commote of Is Cennan with appurtenances concerning which Llywelyn ap Rhys Vaghan, ancestor of the said Gilbert, whose heir he is, was seised in his lordship as of fee on the day he died etc. And one said that the said Llywelyn ap Rhys, ancestor etc., was seised in his lordship as of fee in the time of peace in the time of King Edward, grandfather of the present lord king,

taking thence profits to the value etc. And thence he died seised etc. And from the said Llywelyn who died without heirs the fee reverted to a certain Wenthavia as aunt and heir of the sister of Rhys, father of the said Llywelyn, etc. And from the said Wenthavia the fee descended etc. to a certain Richard as son and heir etc. And from the said Richard, the fee descended etc. to this Gilbert as son and heir who now seeks etc. concerning which etc. And thence he produced suit.

And Ralph and Eleanor through William de Westhale, their attorney, came. And they defended their right which etc. And they said that the present lord king through his charter by his special grace gave and granted to a certain John de Wilington who died and to the same Ralph by the name Ralph, son of the same John and Eleanor, wife of the said Ralph, the castle of Carreg Cennan with appurtenances which was of John de Maltravers, enemy and rebel of the king, and that through the forfeiture of the same John de Maltravers returned as escheat into the hand of the king, to have and to hold by the same John de Wilington, Ralph and Eleanor and the legitimate heirs of the body of the said Ralph together with lands and rents and the commote of Is Cennan, also knights fees, advowsons of churches, liberties, customs and all other advantages pertaining to the said castle, lands, tenements and commotes whatsoever from the king and his heirs and other chief lords of that fee through service and customs thence owed in perpetuity. Thus that if the same Ralph should die without legitimate heirs of his body then after the death of the said John, Ralph and Eleanor, the said castle and commote with appurtenances ought to remain to Henry, son of Henry de Wilington, and the legitimate male heirs of his body to hold from the lord king etc. through service thence owed etc. in perpetuity. And if the same Henry son of Henry should die without legitimate male heirs then after the death of the said Henry son of Henry the said castle and commote with appurtenances should remain to the right heirs of the said Ralph to hold from the lord king and his heirs and other chief lords etc. through the aforesaid services in perpetuity . . . And in this way came as the said Gilbert as the said Ralph and Eleanor through their aforesaid attorneys. And the same Ralph and Eleanor maintained that the said Llywelyn ap Rhys, ancestor, was not seised of the said tenement on the day which he died as the said Gilbert through his writ put forth. . .

CP40/375/275 (Michaelmas 27 Edward III) (see pp. 185-86)

(Dorset) Robert, Bishop of Salisbury, through Richard de Sobbury, his attorney, sought against William, earl of Salisbury, the castle of Sherborne with appurtenances as the right of his church of the Blessed Mary, Salisbury, and to hold from the king in chief, etc. And whence he said that a certain Jocelinus, lately bishop of Salisbury, predecessor of the said Bishop who now was seised in his lordship as of fee and right of his church of the blessed Mary aforesaid in the time of peace in the time of the lord King Richard, ancestor of the present lord king, taking thence profits to the value, etc. And that such is his right and concerning his aforesaid church he appears [in court]. And the earl through Robert Lough his attorney came. And he defended his right

that etc. And he said that the present king through his letters patent gave granted and confirmed to a certain William de Montagu, father of the same earl, whose heir he is, and Katherine, his wife, the said castle with appurtenances as likewise with the castle of Christchurch Tynham, hundred of Christchurch and all other manors with appurtenances to have and to hold to the same William de Montagu and Katherine and the heirs legitimately arisen from the body of the said William together with knights fees, advowsons of churches . . . and all other things pertaining to the same castle, hundred, and manors with appurtenances howsoever and whensoever belonging or pertaining without any reservation from the same king and his heirs and all chief lords of those fees, indeed freely, fully and wholly in all things as those who held the said castle of Sherborne, etc., before it came into the hand of the progenitors of the same lord king, once king of England, and the same present lord king, and through the same service through which they were then held in perpetuity in full satisfaction of £1000 of land etc. Thus that if the said William de Montagu should die without heirs, then after the death of the said William de Montagu and the said Katherine, the said castle of Sherborne . . . should wholly revert to the lord king and his heirs, which certain letters patent, the same earl put forth here in court which premises are attested etc. of which it was given at Westminster the eighteenth day of January in the fourth year of the reign of the same present lord king. And thus he said that he held the same castle of Sherborne as etc. after the death of the said William de Montagu and Katherine by virtue of the said grant, and that he cannot respond to the said bishop without the lord king . . .

APPENDIX 8 Principal Geographical Areas of Interest¹

CI= Channel Islands
 EA= East Anglia (Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridgeshire)
 EM= East Midlands (Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire,
 Northamptonshire, Nottinghamshire, Rutland)
 F= France
 I= Ireland
 IM= Isle of Man
 N= North (Durham, Cumbria, Northumberland)
 NW= Northwest (Cheshire, Lancashire)
 S= Scotland
 SE= Southeast (Bedfordshire, Berkshire, Essex, Hampshire,
 Hertfordshire, Kent, London, Middlesex, Oxfordshire,
 Surrey, Sussex)
 SW= Southwest (Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Gloucestershire,
 Somerset, Wiltshire)
 W= Wales
 WM= West Midlands (Herefordshire, Shropshire, Staffordshire,
 Warwickshire, Worcestershire)
 Y= Yorkshire

-brackets denote rough approximation from lack of evidence concerning lands or offices
 -when abbreviations are repeated in the second column it means further royal grants by Edward III have come in the same area
 -bold type indicates identifiable changes through marriage

Name	Start of Career ²	1330-77	Change ³
Audley, J	unknown	unknown	
Creting	(EA, EM)		
Darcy	EA, EM, I, N, NW, Y	EM, I, Y	
Hausted	EA, EM, SE		
Verdon	EA, EM, SE	EA, EM	
Uvedale	EA, EM, SE, SW, W		
Ros	EA, EM, Y	EM	
Kerdeston	EA, EM		
Sutton	N, EA, EM, SE, WM, Y		
Frene	W, WM	EM, NW, SE SW, WM, Y	EM, NW, SE SW, Y
Erdington	SE, SW, WM		
Meinill	N, Y		

¹ This is meant to indicate a minimum of the areas of interest of a new man. It should be noted that the sources used, especially the Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem, do not include lands enfeoffed to use or otherwise neglected by the escheator. Geographical regions defined as per Ordnance Survey, though with mediaeval county names and boundaries. Statlas UK: A Statistical Atlas of the United Kingdom (Southampton, 1995).

² Or in 1330.

³ That is, substantial change as a result of Edward III's patronage. Much of the most important change in this column is the result of the marriage of a new peer - which, often through chance, changed the makeup of a peer's estate. See Chapter Three.

Audley, H	EA, EM, I, SE, SW, W	EM	
Bohun, W	SE	EM, SE, SW, W, WM	EM, SW, W, WM ⁴
Clinton	EA, EM, NW, SE, SW, WM	EA, EM, NW, SE	
Grosmont	EA, EM, NW, SE	EA, F, NW, SE, SW, W, Y	F
	SW, W, WM, Y		
Montagu, W	EA, N, SE, SW	CI, EA, EM, I, IM	CI, I, IM, EM
		NW, S, SE, SW, W	IM, NW, S
Ufford, R	EA, EM, SE, Y	EA, EM, SE	
Swynnerton	NW, WM	NW, WM	
Leyburn	N, SW, WM		
Chaundos	SW, WM, W	W	
Grey	EM, SE, SW, WM, Y	SE	
Kirketon, T	unknown	unknown	
Coleville	EA, EM, N		
Bulmer	EM, N, Y		
Ughtred	Y	N, S, Y	N, S
Dagworth	(EA, SE)	EA, EM, I, SE, SW, WM	I, WM
Bradeston	SW	S, SE, SW, W	S, SE, W
Cobham	SE	EA, SE, SW	EA, SW
Manny	F	EA, EM, SE, WM, W	EA, EM, SE
			WM, W ⁵
Browse	SE, SW	SE, SW	
St. Philbert	EA, SE, SW	SE	
Husee	EM, SE, SW		
Bouchier	SE	SE	
Lovel	S, SW, W		
Montagu, E	EA	EA, SE	
Poynings, M	EA, SE	EA, EM, SE, SW	
Musgrave	N	S, Y	S, Y
Burnell		EM, SW, WM	EM, SW, WM
Brian	SW, WM, W	SW, WM, W	
Scrope, H le	EM, N, SE, WM, Y		
Beauchamp, J	SW	SE, WM	SE, WM
Stafford, Ra	WM, SE	EA, EM, I, NW	EA, EM, I, NW
		SW, W, WM, Y	SW, W, Y
		(EA, EM)	
Huntingfield	EA, EM, SE	CI, EA, EM, F	CI, EA, EM, F
Holand	(EM)	SE, SW, WM, Y	SE, SW, WM, Y
		SE, SW	SE, SW
Montagu, J	N	SE	
Lisle	EA, EM, SE, Y	EA	
Benhale	EA		
Ufford, J	EA		
Norwich	EA	EA	
Kirketon, J	EM	EM	
Stryvelyn		N, S, Y	N, S, Y
Bohun, J	EA, EM, I, SE	SE	
Beauchamp, R	SE	EM, S, SE, SW, Y	EM, S, SW, Y
De la Pole	EM, Y	EA, Y	EA
Poynings, L	SE	SE	
Botreaux	SE, SW		
Aton	EM, Y	Y	
Heron	N	N	

⁴ Some of this change was the result of Bohun's marriage to Elizabeth, widow of Edmund Mortimer.

⁵ This change was also in part due to his marriage to Margaret, widow of John de Segrave, Lord Segrave, and daughter and coheir of Thomas of Brotherton, earl of Norfolk.

Basset	EM, Y		
Aldeburgh	Y		
Scrope, R le	EM, SE, Y	EA, SE	EA
Stafford, Ri	(WM)	WM	
Cromwell	EA, EM, WM	EM	
Clifton	EA		

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

*I. Manuscript Sources**Public Record Office, Chancery Lane, London*

- C47 Chancery Miscellanea
- C49 Chancery, Parliamentary and Council Proceedings
- C143 Inquisitions ad quod Damnum
- C260 Chancery, Recorda
- CP40 Common Pleas
- E13 Exchequer of Pleas, Plea Rolls
- E101 Exchequer, King's Remembrancer, Various Accounts
- E106 Alien Priorities
- E122 Customs Accounts
- E159 Exchequer Memoranda Rolls, King's Remembrancer
- E175 Exchequer, King's Remembrancer, Parliament and Council Proceedings
- E207 Exchequer, King's Remembrancer, Bille
- E208 Exchequer, King's Remembrancer, Brevia Baronibus
- E356 Customs Accounts
- E372 Pipe Office, Pipe Rolls
- E401 Exchequer Receipt Rolls
- E403 Exchequer Issue Rolls
- E404 Exchequer Warrants for Issue
- KB27 Plea Rolls of the King's Bench
- KB29 Controlment Rolls
- SC1 Special Collections, Ancient Correspondence
- SC8 Special Collections, Ancient Petitions

British Library, London

- Additional Ms. 38462 F1
- Cotton Charter xi 61
- Cotton Ms. Julius B xii
- Harleian 805 230
- Harleian Charter 43 D26
- Harleian Charter 43 D5
- Landsdowne Ms. 207A

2. Printed Sources

Abstracts of Feet of Fines Relating to Wiltshire for the
Reign of Edward III, ed. C.R. Elrington (Wiltshire
Record Society, vol. 29; Devizes, 1973).

Abstracts of Inquisitions Post Mortem for Gloucestershire,
Part V (1302-1358) ed. E.A. Fry (BRS, vol. 40, 1910;
reprint London, 1968).

Adae Murimuth Continuatio Chronicarum, ed. E. Maunde Thompson
(RS, London, 1889).

- The Ancient Kalendars and Inventories of the Treasury of His Majesty's Exchequer, 3 vols. ed. F. Palgrave (London, 1836).
- Anglo-Norman Political Songs, ed. by I.S.T. Aspin, (Anglo-Norman Text Society XI, 1953).
- The Anonimalle Chronicle: 1333 to 1381, ed. V.H. Galbraith (Manchester, 1927).
- Calendar of Chancery Warrants (1244-1326), (London, 1927).
- Calendar of Chancery Rolls (1277-1326), (London, 1926).
- Calendar of Charter Rolls (1226-1516), 6 vols. (London, 1916-27).
- Calendar of Close Rolls (1272-1485), 45 vols. (London, 1892-1954).
- Calendar of Fine Rolls (1272-1509), 22 vols. (London, 1911-62).
- Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous (1219-1422), 7 vols. (London, 1916-68).
- Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem (Henry III to 6 Hen. IV), 18 vols. (London, 1904-88).
- Calendar of Memoranda Rolls: Exchequer (1326-27), (London, 1968).
- Calendar of Patent Rolls (1232-1509), 52 vols. (London, 1891-1916).
- Chandos Herald, The Life and Feats of Arms of Edward, the Black Prince, trans. Francisque-Michel (London, 1883).
- Chronica Johannis de Reading et Anonymi Cantuariensis 1346-67, ed. J. Tait (Manchester, 1914).
- Croniques de London, ed. G.J. Aungier (CS, London, 1844).
- A Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient Deeds in the Public Record Office, 6 vols. (London, 1890-1915).
- De Speculo Regis Edwardi Terti, ed. J. Moisant (Paris, 1891).
- Dialogus de Scaccario, trans. C. Johnson (London, 1950).
- Douglas Simpson, W., ed. The Building Accounts of Tattershall Castle: 1434-1472 (Lincoln Record Society, vol. 55, 1960).
- The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis, M. Chibnall, ed. and trans. (Oxford, 1978).

Edwards, J.G. ed., Calendar of Ancient Correspondence Concerning Wales (Cardiff, 1935).

Foedera Conventiones Litterae et Cuiuscunque Generis Acta Publica, ed. T. Rymer, 7 vols. (Record Commission 1819-1869).

Gray, T. Scalacronica: The Reigns of Edward I, Edward II and Edward III, trans. H. Maxwell (Glasgow, 1907).

Issue Roll of Thomas de Brantingham (1370), ed. F. Devon (London, 1835).

Issues of the Exchequer from Henry III to Henry IV, ed. F. Devon (London, 1837).

A Perfect Copy of All Summons of the Nobility to the Great Councils and Parliaments of the Realm, ed. W.A. Dugdale (London, 1685).

Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis, C. Babbington and J.R. Lumby 9 vols. (London, RS, 1865-86).

Rees, W., ed. Calendar of Ancient Petitions Relating to Wales (Cardiff, 1975).

Register of Edward the Black Prince (1346-65) 4 parts (London, 1930-33).

Register of the Great Seal of Scotland: 1306-1424, ed. J.M. Thomson (1912).

Rotulorum Originalium in Curia Scaccarii Abbreviatio 2 vols. (London, 1810)

Rotuli Scotiae, 2 vols. (London, 1814-19).

Statutes of the Realm 11 vols. (London, 1810-28).

Survey of the Honour of Denbigh: 1334, ed. P. Vinogradoff and F. Morgan, British Academy: Records of Social and Economic History 1 (London, 1914).

Testamenta Vetusta, ed. N.H. Nicolas, 2 vols (London, 1826).

Vita Edwardi Secundi, N. Denholm-Young, trans. and ed. (London, 1957).

The Wardrobe Book of William de Norwell: 12 July 1338 to 27 May 1340, ed. M. Lyon, B. Lyon and H.S. Lucas, and J. de Sturler (Brussels, 1983).

3. Reference Works

Cokayne, G.E. The Complete Peerage 12 vols. (London, 1910-59).

Dictionary of National Biography 63 vols. (London, 1885-1900).

Dugdale, W. The Baronage of England (London, 1676).

Guide to the Contents of the Public Record Office (London, 1963).

Graves, E.B., ed. A Bibliography of English History to 1485 (London, 1975).

Ordnance Survey, Statlas UK: A Statistical Atlas of the United Kingdom (Southampton, 1995)

4. Unpublished Theses

Barrie, D.A. 'The Maiores Barones in the Second Half of the Reign of King Edward III (1290-1307)', University of St. Andrews PhD (1991).

Broome, D.M. 'The Exchequer in the Reign of Edward III: 1327-1377', University of Manchester PhD (1922).

Doherty, P.C. 'Isabella Queen of England 1296-1330', University of Oxford DPhil (1977).

Given-Wilson, C. 'The Court and Household of Edward III 1360-1377', University of St. Andrews PhD (1976).

Harvey, B.R. 'The Berkeleys of Berkeley 1281-1417: A Study in Lesser Peerage of Late Mediaeval England', University of Saint Andrews PhD (1988).

Ormrod, W.M. 'Edward III's Government of England, c. 1346-1356', University of Oxford DPhil (1984).

Parker, J.M. 'Patronage and Service: The Careers of William Montagu, Earl of Salisbury, William Clinton, Earl of Huntingdon, Robert Ufford, Earl of Suffolk, and William Bohun, Earl of Northampton', University of Durham MA (1986).

Walker, S.S. 'Royal Wardship in Medieval England', University of Chicago PhD (1966).

Waugh, S.L. 'The Confiscated Lands of the 'Contrariants' in Gloucestershire and Herefordshire in 1322: An Economic and Social Survey', University of London PhD (1975).

5. Secondary Works

- Altschul, M. A Baronial Family in Medieval England: The Clares 1217-1314 (Baltimore, 1965).
- Archer, R.E., 'The Estates and Finances of Margaret of Brotherton, c. 1320-1399', BIHR lx (1987), 264-280.
- Archer, R.E. 'Rich Old Ladies: The Problem of Late Medieval Dowagers', in A.J. Pollard, ed. Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History (Gloucester, 1984), 15-35.
- Austin, R. 'Notes on the Family of Bradeston', Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, xlvii (1925), 279-86.
- Ayton, A. Knights and Warhorses: Military Service and the English Aristocracy under Edward III (Woodbridge, 1994).
- Baker, J.H. An Introduction to English Legal History Third Edition (London, 3rd ed., 1990).
- Baker, R.L. The English Customs Service: A Study of Medieval Administration (Philadelphia, 1961).
- Bean, J.M.W. The Decline of English Feudalism: 1215-1540 (Manchester, 1968).
- Bean, J.M.W. From Lord to Patron: Lordship in Late Medieval England (Manchester, 1989).
- Bellamy, J.G. The Law of Treason in England in the Later Middle Ages (Cambridge, 1970).
- Beltz, G.F. Memorials of the Order of the Garter (London, 1841).
- Brown, A.L. 'The Authorization of Letters under the Great Seal', BIHR xxxvii (1964), 125-56.
- Brown, A.L. The Governance of Late Mediaeval England 1272-1461 (London, 1989).
- Church, S.D. 'The Rewards of Royal Service in the Household of King John: A Dissenting Opinion', EHR cx (1995), 277-302.
- Clarke, M.V. Mediaeval Representation and Consent (London 1936).
- Cosgrove, A., ed. A New History of Ireland, vol. ii Medieval Ireland 1169-1534 (Oxford, 1993).

- Coss, P.R., and Lloyd, S.D. eds. Thirteenth Century England I: Proceedings of the Newcastle upon Tyne Conference, 1985 (Woodbridge, 1986).
- Cronne, H.A. The Reign of Stephen 1135-54: Anarchy in England (London, 1970).
- Crouch, D. The Image of the Aristocracy in Britain, 1000-1300 (London, 1992).
- D'Arcy, R.F. The Life of John First Baron Darcy of Knayth (London, 1933).
- Davies, J.C. The Baronial Opposition to Edward II: Its Character and Policy (London, reprint 1967).
- Davies, R.R. Conquest, Coexistence, and Change: Wales 1063-1415 (Oxford, 1987).
- Davies, R.R. Lordship and Society in the March of Wales: 1282-1400 (Oxford, 1978).
- Davis, R.H.C. King Stephen 1135-1154 (2nd Imp. London, 1980).
- Davis, R.H.C. 'What Happened in Stephen's Reign', History xlix (1964), 1-12.
- DeAragon, R.C. 'The Growth of Secure Inheritance in Anglo-Norman England', JMH 8 (1982), 381-91.
- DeAragon, R.C. 'In Pursuit of Aristocratic Women: A Key to Success in Norman England', Albion 14 (1982), 258-66.
- Douch, R. 'The Career, Lands and Family of William Montague, Earl of Salisbury, 1301-44', BIHR xxiv (1951), 85-88.
- Duls, L.D. Richard II in the Early Chronicles (The Hague, 1975).
- Dunham, W.H., Morris, W.A., Strayer, J.R., and Willard, E.F., eds. The English Government at Work 1327-36 3 vols. (Cambridge (Mass.), 1940-50).
- Edwards, J.G., Galbraith, V.H. and Jacobs, E.F. eds., Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait (Manchester, 1933).
- Ellis, G. Earldoms in Fee: A Study in Peerage Law and History (London, 1963).
- Elton, G.R. England 1200-1640 (London, 1969).
- Fairbank, F.R. 'The Last Earl of Warrene and Surrey, and the Distribution of his Possessions', Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, xix:2 (1907), 193-264.

- Farran, C.D. The Principles of Scots and English Land Law: A Historical Comparison (Edinburgh, 1958).
- Fleming, R. Kings and Lords in Conquest England (Cambridge, 1991).
- Fowler, K. The King's Lieutenant: Henry of Grosmont, First Duke of Lancaster 1310-1361 (London, 1961).
- Fryde, E.B. 'Materials for the Study of Edward III's Credit Operations, 1327-48', BIHR xxii (1949), 105-138 and BIHR xxiii (1950), 1-30.
- Fryde, E.B. William de la Pole: Merchant and King's Banker (London, 1988).
- Fryde, N. The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II: 1321-26 (Cambridge, 1979).
- Given-Wilson, C. The English Nobility in the Late Middle Ages: The Fourteenth-Century Political Community (London, 1987).
- Given-Wilson, C. 'Richard II and his Grandfather's Will', EHR lxxxixiii (1978), 320-37.
- Given-Wilson, C. 'Royal Charter Witness Lists', Medieval Prosopography, 12:2 (1991), 35-93.
- Given-Wilson, C. The Royal Household and the King's Affinity: Service, Politics and Finance in England 1360-1413 (London and New Haven, 1986).
- Given-Wilson, C. 'Wealth and Credit, Public and Private: The Earls of Arundel 1306-1397', EHR cvi (1991), 1-26.
- Grandsen, A. Historical Writing in England 2 vols. (London, 1974-82).
- Hall, H. A History of the Custom-Revenue in England from the Earliest Times to the Year 1827 2 vols. (1885; reprint New York, 1970).
- Harriss, G.L. 'Fictitious Loans', ECHR 2nd series 8:2 (1955-56), 187-99.
- Harriss, G.L. 'Preference at the Medieval Exchequer', BIHR xxx (1975), 17-40.
- Harriss, G.L., ed., Henry V: The Practice of Kingship (Oxford, 1975; reprint 1993).
- Harriss, G.L. King, Parliament, and Public Finance to 1369 (Oxford, 1975).

- Hay, D. 'The Division of the Spoils of War in Fourteenth Century England', TRHS 5th Series iv (1954), 91-109.
- Hilton, R.H. The English Peasantry in the Later Middle Ages (Oxford, 1975).
- Hollister, C.W. Monarchy, Magnates and Institutions in the Anglo-Norman World (London, 1986).
- Holmes, G.A. The Estates of the Higher Nobility in Fourteenth-Century England (Cambridge, 1957).
- Holt, J.C. Magna Carta (Cambridge, 1965).
- Hughes, D. A Study of the Social and Constitutional Tendencies in the Early Years of Edward III (London, 1915; reprint Philadelphia, 1978).
- An Inventory of the Ancient Monuments in Wales and Monmouthshire vol. iv, County of Denbigh (London, 1914).
- Jeffries, P. 'The Medieval Use as Family Law and Custom: The Berkshire Gentry in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries', Southern History 1 (1979), 45-69.
- Jenkinson, H. 'Exchequer Tallies', Archaeologia lxii:2 (1911), 367-80.
- Jenkinson, H. 'Mary de Sancto Paulo, Foundress of Pembroke College, Cambridge', Archaeologia lxvii (1914-15), 410-46.
- Jewell, H.M. English Local Administration in the Middle Ages (Newton Abbott, 1972).
- Kaeuper, R.W. War, Justice, and Public Order: England and France in the Later Middle Ages (Oxford, 1988).
- Keen, M.H. The Laws of War in the Late Middle Ages (London, 1965).
- King, E., ed. The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign (Oxford, 1994).
- Knowles, C.H. 'The Resettlement of England after the Barons' War, 1264-67', TRHS 5th series xxxii (1982), 25-41.
- Knowles, D. and Hadcock, R.N. Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales (London, 1971).
- Lally, J.E. 'Secular Patronage in the Court of King Henry II', BIHR xxxix (1976), 159-84.
- Lyon, B.D. 'The Money Fief under the English Kings', EHR lxvi (1951), 161-93.

- Maclean, S. 'Knights' Fees in Gloucestershire', Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society xi (1886-87), 312-30.
- Maddicott, J.R. Thomas of Lancaster 1307-1322 (Oxford, 1970).
- Matthew, D. Norman Monasteries and their English Possessions (Oxford, 1962).
- McFarlane, K.B. The Nobility of Later Medieval England Reprint; Oxford, 1980).
- McHardy, A. 'The Effects of War on the Church: The Case of the Alien Priories in the Fourteenth Century', in M. Jones and M. Vale, eds., England and Her Neighbours 1066-1453: Essays in Honour of Pierre Chaplais (London, 1989).
- McKisack, M. The Fourteenth Century: 1307-1399 (Oxford, 1959).
- Mertes, K. The English Noble Household 1250-1600: Good Governance and Politic Rule (Oxford, 1988).
- Milsom, S.F.C. Historical Foundations of the Common Law (London, 1969).
- Milsom, S.F.C. 'The Origin of Prerogative Wardship', in G. Garnet and J. Hudson, eds. Law and Government in Mediaeval England and Normandy: Essays in Honour of Sir James Holt (Cambridge, 1994).
- Moore, A.W. A History of the Isle of Man (London, 1900; reprint 1977).
- Morgan, M.M. 'The Suppression of the Alien Priories', History, 26 (1941), 204-12.
- Morgan, P. War and Society in Medieval Cheshire: 1277-1403 Chetham Society, 3rd ser. xxxiv (Manchester, 1987).
- Morris, J.E. The Welsh Wars of Edward I (Oxford, 1901).
- Mott, R.A.K. 'A Study in the Distribution of Patronage, 1389-99', Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society: Literature and History Section Proceedings XV pt. 5 (1974), 113-33.
- Newman, C.A. The Anglo-Norman Nobility in the Reign of Henry I: The Second Generation (Philadelphia, 1988).
- Neville, C.J. 'The Law of Treason in the English Border Counties in the Later Middle Ages', Law and History Review 9:1 (1991), 1-30.
- Ormrod, W.M. 'Edward III and his Family', Journal of British Studies, xxvi (1987), 398-442.

- Ormrod, W.M. 'Edward III and the Recovery of Royal Authority in England', History 72 (1987), 4-19.
- Ormrod, W.M. 'The English Crown and the Customs, 1349-63', ECHR, 2nd ser. xl (1987), 27-39.
- Ormrod, W.M. 'The Procolla Rolls and English Government Finance, 1353-1364', EHR cii (1987), 622-32.
- Ormrod, W.M. The Reign of Edward III: Crown and Political Society in England 1327-1377 (New Haven, 1990).
- Payling, S.J. 'Social Mobility, Demographic Change, and Landed Society in Late Medieval England', ECHR xlv:1 (1992), 51-73.
- Phillips, J.R.S. Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke: 1307-1324 (Oxford, 1972).
- Plucknett, T.F.T. A Concise History of the Common Law 4th ed. (London, 1948).
- Pollard, A.J. Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History (Gloucester, 1984).
- Pollard, A.J. The Wars of the Roses (Basingstoke, 1988).
- Pollock, F. and Maitland, F.W. The History of English Law Before the Time of Edward I (Second Edition; Cambridge, 1968).
- Potter's Historical Introduction to English Law and its Institutions (Fourth Edition; London, 1958).
- Pounds, N.J.G. The Medieval Castle in England and Wales: A Social and Political History (Cambridge, 1990).
- Powell, J.E. and Wallis, K. The House of Lords in the Middle Ages (London, 1968).
- Prestwich, M. The Three Edwards: War and State in England 1272-1377 (London, 1980).
- Pronay, N. and Taylor, J., ed. Parliamentary Texts of the Later Middle Ages (Oxford, 1980).
- Public Record Office Lists and Indexes IX: Lists of Sheriffs for England and Wales (New York, 1963).
- Raban, S. Mortmain Legislation and the English Church (Cambridge, 1982).
- Rawcliffe, C. The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham 1394-1521 (Cambridge, 1978).

- 'Reports from the Lords' Committees Appointed to Search the Journals of the House, Rolls of Parliament, and Other Records for All Matters Touching the Dignity of a Peer', in Journal of the House of Lords (London, 1820-29).
- Ridgeway, H.W. 'Foreign Favourites and Henry III's Problems of Patronage, 1247-1258', EHR civ (1989), 590-610.
- Rigby, S.H. 'The Customs Administration at Boston in the Reign of Richard II', BIHR lviii (1985), 12-24.
- Rosenthal, J.T. 'Aristocratic Marriage and the English Peerage, 1350-1500: Social Institution and Personal Bond', JMH 10 (1984), 181-94.
- Roskell, J.S. The Impeachment of Michael de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk in 1386 in the Context of the Reign of Richard II (Manchester, 1984).
- Saul, N. Knights and Esquires: The Gloucestershire Gentry in the Fourteenth Century (Oxford, 1981).
- Sayles, G.O. The King's Parliament of England (London, 1975).
- Selden, J. Titles of Honour (London, 1631).
- Simpson, A.W.B. An Introduction to the History of the Land Law (Oxford, 1961).
- Somerville, R. History of the Duchy of Lancaster, 2 vols. (London, 1953-70).
- Smyth, J. The Lives of the Berkeleys, 3 vols. (Gloucester, 1883).
- Southern, R.W. Medieval Humanism and Other Studies (Oxford, 1970).
- Steel, A. 'The Marginalia of the Treasurer's Receipt Rolls', BIHR vii-viii (1929-30), passim (in three instalments).
- Steel, A. 'The Practice of Assignment in the Later Fourteenth Century', EHR xliii (1928), 172-80.
- Steel, A. Receipt of the Exchequer 1377-1485 (Cambridge, 1954).
- Stones, E.L.G. 'The Folvilles of Ashby-Folville, Leicestershire, and their Associates in Crime 1326-1347', TRHS 5th Series vii (1957), 117-36.
- Terry, S.B. The Financing of the Hundred Years War 1337-1369 (London, 1914).
- Tout, T.F. Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England: The Wardrobe, The Chamber and the Small Seals 6 vols. (Manchester, 1928).

- Tuck, A. Crown and Nobility 1272-1461: Political Conflict in Late Medieval England (London, 1985).
- Tuck, J.A. 'Richard II's System of Patronage', in The Reign of Richard II: Essays in Honour of May McKisack, ed. F.R.H. Du Boulay and C.M. Barron (London, 1971).
- Turner, R.V. Men Raised from the Dust: Administrative Service and Upward Mobility in Angevin England (Philadelphia, 1988).
- Unwin, G., ed. Finance and Trade under Edward III (Manchester, 1918).
- Vale, J. Edward III and Chivalry: Chivalric Society and its Context 1270-1350 (Woodbridge, 1982).
- VCH: A History of Berkshire 4 vols. (London, 1906-24).
- VCH: A History of Buckinghamshire 4 vols. (London, 1905-27).
- VCH: A History of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight 5 vols. (London, 1900-12).
- Walker, S.S. 'The Action of Waste in the Early Common Law', in J.H. Baker, ed. Legal Records and the Historian (London, 1978).
- Walker, S.S. 'Free Consent and Marriage of Feudal Wards in Medieval England', JMH 8 (1982), 123-34.
- Walker, S.S. 'Punishing Convicted Ravishers: Statutory Strictures and Actual Practice in Thirteenth and Fourteenth-century England', JMH 13 (1987), 237-50.
- Ward, J.C. English Noblewomen in the Later Middle Ages (Harlow, Essex, 1992).
- Waugh, S.L. England in the Reign of Edward III (Cambridge, 1991).
- Waugh, S.L. 'Marriage, Class, and Royal Lordship in England under Henry III', Viator xvi (1985), 198-206.
- Waugh, S.L. The Lordship of England: Royal Wardships and Marriages in English Society and Politics 1217-1327 (Princeton, 1988).
- Waugh, S.L. 'Women's Inheritance and the Growth of Bureaucratic Monarchy in Twelfth and Thirteenth-Century England', Nottingham Medieval Studies xxxiv (1990), 71-92.
- Wentersdorf, K.P. 'The Clandestine Marriages of the Fair Maid of Kent', JMH 5 (1979), 203-31.
- Wilkinson, B. 'The Protest of the Earls of Arundel and Surrey in the Crisis of 1341', EHR xxxvi (1931), 177-193.

- Willard, J.F. 'The Crown and its Creditors, 1327-33', EHR xlii (1927), 12-19.
- Wolffe, B.P. The Royal Demesne in English History: The Crown Estate in the Governance of the Realm from the Conquest to 1509 (London, 1971).
- Wright, J.R. The Church and the English Crown 1305-1334: A Study based on the Register of Archbishop Walter Reynolds (Toronto, 1980).